

REPORT OF

STATE PARKS SURVEY

OF

CALIFORNIA

**REPORT OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE PARK COMMISSION**

**To His Excellency, C. C. Young,**

**Governor of the State of California, and**

**To the Senate and Assembly, General Legislature. (1929)**

**Sirs:**

Acting under authority conferred by Chapter 764 of the Statutes of 1927, the State Park Commission submits herewith its report embodying the results of the state-wide survey of potential state park areas. Section 1 of the Act referred to provides as follows:

"The department of natural resources, through the state park commission is hereby authorized and directed to make a survey to determine what lands are suitable and desirable for the ultimate development of a comprehensive, well-balanced state park system, and to define the relation of such a system to other means of conserving and utilizing the scenic and recreational resources of the state; to make a report embodying the results of the survey; to make recommendations regarding the means by which such a park system can be acquired. Said report and recommendations shall be filed with the secretary of state on or before December 31, 1928."

In order to carry out the foregoing direction and defray the expenses of the survey, \$15,000 was made available by the Act.

The same Legislature (Chapter 765 of the Statutes of 1927) also created the State Park Commission. One of the first acts of the newly appointed State Park Commission was the selection of

Frederick Law Olmsted to take charge of and undertake this survey in cooperation with the Commission. The Commission was fortunate in inducing Mr. Olmsted to accept this appointment. To direct the making of the survey with the infinite details of such a vast undertaking has meant a great personal sacrifice on Mr. Olmsted's part, involving the taking of time from other important and more lucrative employment. It means, practically, the donation of a considerable portion of his valuable time to the State.

A state-wide park survey of California presents problems of a magnitude and complexity which probably do not exist to the same degree in any other state. The great size of California, its longitudinal extent with a coast line of almost a thousand miles in length, its magnificent beaches, its extensive mountain ranges, variety of climate, the fact that, for these reasons, it contains some of the finest specimens of trees and forested areas to be found anywhere in the world, multiplies the problems of survey.

Mr. Olmsted lost no time in organizing the survey. The state was divided into districts, the Park Commission held public meetings in both Los Angeles and San Francisco where representatives of all interested organizations were in attendance and a little later questionnaires were sent out to individuals and organizations throughout the state in order that all available information on the subject might be received. Volunteer Regional

Reporters and Advisory Groups were selected to assist in this work. These volunteers worked without compensation and the Commission cannot express in generous enough terms its obligation to these self-sacrificing individuals for the valuable aid they have rendered and the information which they have furnished the Survey and the Commission. Without the splendid cooperation of these public spirited citizens, the survey could not have been completed with the funds available and within the prescribed time limit. The State Park Commission desires to publicly express to these individuals its deep and abiding obligation and appreciation of their helpful assistance.

Upwards of 525 park projects were recommended from various sources. All of these received consideration and those which held out any promise of being of potential state park caliber were personally inspected and reported on by some representative of the park survey.

All of this great mass of material which has been collected regarding these proposed state park areas has been carefully examined and classified by Mr. Olmsted, and recommendations made as to the relative desirability of acquiring these areas for state park purposes. The results of the survey are embodied in Mr. Olmsted's report which accompanies and is made a part of this formal report of the State Park Commission.

We cannot praise too highly this magnificent report which deals with the problems in hand in a masterly fashion. There



is no doubt but that as soon as this report is made public there will be a demand for copies from all parts of the United States because of the outstanding and comprehensive manner in which these state park problems are treated. The report speaks for itself and is a masterpiece in its line.

On November 6th, last, the people of the state, by vote of 975,979 for, and 346, 998 against, overwhelmingly ratified what is commonly known as the State Park Bond Act. This act was also, as a preliminary to submission to the people, passed by the last Legislature (Chapter 765, Statutes of 1927) and provides for the issuance of \$6,000,000 in state bonds to be used for the purchase of park lands, provided always that in making any purchase one-half of the cost of the project is given to the state by contributions in money or land. The importance of the passage of this bond issue cannot be over-estimated for it means that the state will eventually acquire \$12,000,000 worth of state property with an expenditure of only \$6,000,000. The feature of matching dollar for dollar will encourage and stimulate gifts, of both money and land. Already the Commission has received information of prospective gifts, notably of the Elias property, including Rubicon Point on Lake Tahoe and of various memorial groves of redwoods along the Redwood Highway. All of these are about to be donated to the state for park purposes on condition that an equal value of state bond money be used to add

to the areas donated. The Commission has also applied to the United States Government to set aside certain outstanding areas in the desert regions of Southern California, and in other portions of the state, for the purpose of eventually adding them to the State Park system.

The importance of this whole park movement which the last legislature so wisely inaugurated and which the Governor of this State has so enthusiastically supported and which the people of the state have so overwhelmingly approved, cannot be over-estimated. California, because of its natural and scenic resources, is one of the most favored states in the Union. These resources are of incalculable value and the state has a vital interest in their preservation. A great opportunity is now open to preserve some of the best of these areas and in the accompanying report of Mr. Olmsted's, the Commission is receiving advice and information of the highest order to guide it in its policy of the acquisition of these lands.

With grateful acknowledgment to all those who have rendered such able and generous assistance in the furnishing and presentation of the basic data which have been incorporated therein, the attached report and recommendations are respectfully submitted.

December 31, 1928

Approved: Fred G. Stevanot  
Director Department of  
Natural Resources

William E. Colby, Chairman  
Frederick R. Barnhart  
W. F. Chandler  
Henry W. O'Malley  
Ray Lyman Wilbur  
State Park Commissioners

To the California State Park Commission,

Gentlemen:

I submit herewith the report of the survey conducted under your instructions in pursuance of Chapter 764 of the Statutes of 1927, as presented to and discussed with you on December 14th together with certain amplifications then agreed upon.

Respectfully submitted

*Frederick Law Olmsted*

Frederick Law Olmsted  
DIRECTOR OF SURVEY.

December 29th, 1928

REPORT

OF THE

DIRECTOR OF THE SURVEY

PART I. SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE SURVEY, METHOD OF  
CONDUCTING IT AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

The scope of the Survey as authorized by the legislature is very broad, comprising not only investigations "to determine what lands are suitable and desirable for the ultimate development of a comprehensive, well-balanced state park system", but those necessary "to define the relation of such a system to other means of conserving and utilizing the scenic and recreational resources of the State." Fully to comply with the latter part of this authorization would involve a complete and comprehensive analysis of the scenic and recreational resources of California and of all the important means by which they can be conserved and utilized, both through public initiative and through private initiative.

The brief time allotted for making the Survey and the limits of the appropriation available (a total of fifteen thousand dollars including the central office expenses) when compared with the vast extent of the State, the richness and variety of its scenic and recreational resources, the diversity of means employed in utilizing them, and the difficulties of transportation in many areas, made it obvious from the beginning that the study and presentation of so large a scope of facts must be in many respects more superficial, hurried and tentative than I could wish, and that however much knowledge I could obtain of conditions by the most diligent personal observation the conclusions of the Survey must be based, in large part, on data and opinions gathered by numerous collaborators.

The organization adopted was as follows:

1. A small central staff was organized of men professionally trained in dealing with cognate problems. This staff consisted of the undersigned, as Director of the Survey, of Mr. Daniel R. Hull of Los Angeles, former landscape architect of the National Parks Service, of Mr. H. W. Shepherd of Berkeley, landscape architect and professor of landscape architecture at the University of California, and of Mr. Emerson Knight of San Francisco, landscape architect, all members of the Pacific Coast Chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects; supplemented at times by technically trained assistants in the regular employ of Olmsted Brothers. The members of this staff, in view of the public interests at stake, worked at rates of pay much below their normal professional compensation.

2. At my suggestion the Commission selected and appointed representative citizens throughout the State, interested and well-informed on the general subject, to act as Advisers, divided into twelve groups, corresponding with the twelve territorial divisions into which the State was divided for the purposes of the Survey. These districts were as follows:

District I: Del Norte, Humboldt and Mendocino Counties.

District II: Butte, Glenn, Lassen, Modoc, Plumas, Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama and Trinity Counties.

District III: Colusa, El Dorado, Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, Sierra, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba Counties.

District IV: Alameda, Contra Costa, Lake, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Solano and Sonoma Counties.

District V: Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Mariposa, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus and Tuolumne Counties.

District VI: Inyo and Mono Counties.

District VII: Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera and Tulare Counties.

District VIII: Monterey, San Benito, Santa Clara and Santa Cruz Counties.

District IX: Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo and Ventura Counties.

District X: Los Angeles and Orange Counties.

District XI: Riverside and San Bernardino Counties.

District XII: Imperial and San Diego Counties.

A great deal of valuable information and advice was obtained from these Advisers, not only as to the districts specially assigned to each but upon other matters, partly in response to specific questions and partly in response to a general invitation to volunteer advice, suggestions and information. Naturally the response varied, but in the aggregate the amount of time given and the value of the services rendered was very great. These Advisers contributed freely of their time and in some cases incurred considerable expense for travelling and otherwise without charge to the State.

and their districts  
The names of these Advisers were as follows:

✓ Abbott, Clinton G.	(12)	✓ Brown, Jesse K.	(4)
✓ Adair, Dr. H. S.	(7)	✓ Bryant, H. C.	(4)
✓ Adams, Prof. R. L.	(4)	✓ Bryant, Mrs. Susan Bixby	(10)
✓ Albright, Horace	(5)	✓ Bryce, Peter Cooper	(9, 10)
✓ Arnold, Ralph	(10)	✓ Byington, Louis F.	(4)
✓ Baumgartner, J. P.	(10)	✓ Canfield, Robert B.	(9)
✓ Beard, J. E.	(4)	✓ Carlson, G. J.	(10)
✓ Bechberger, W. A.	(12)	✓ Case, Mrs. Henry	(10)
✓ Benbow, Joe	(1)	✓ Chamberlain, Selah	(4)
✓ Bernays, Phil S.	(10)	✓ Chase, Miss Pearl	(9)
✓ Bertola, Dr. Mariana	(4)	✓ Cheney, Chas. H.	(8, 12)
✓ Blow, Ben	(4, 7, 11)	✓ Clements, Dr. Geo. C.	(10)
✓ Braden, Geo.	(10)	✓ Cochran, E. L.	(9)
✓ Briard, H. F.	(1)	✓ Connick, Arthur E.	(1)
✓ Broughton, Este	(3)	✓ Comstock, Dr. John Adams	(10)

✓ Cressy, Frank A. Jr.	(15)	✓ Jackson, Mrs. Harriet	(5)
✓ Cumberson, Mrs. C. E.	(4)	✓ Jenson, Dr. Willis I.	(4)
✓ Dawson, Elmer	(10)	✓ Jeter, Hon. W. T.	(8)
✓ De Golia, E. B.	(3,4)	✓ Johnson, W. Templeton	(12)
✓ Deering, Frank	(4)	✓ Jones, Herbert C.	(8)
✓ Deering, Tom	(11,12)	✓ Kasch, Charles	(1)
✓ Devlin, E. J.	(8)	✓ Knowland, Jos. R. (Historical)	
✓ Dibble, Grace E.	(8)	✓ Kroeber, Dr. A. L. (Historical)	
✓ Diggs, Chas. H.	(10)	✓ Lathrop, F. W.	(4)
✓ Dittmar, M. E.	(2)	✓ Lovekin, A. C.	(9)
✓ Dow, G. W.	(6)	✓ Lungren, Fernand	(9)
✓ Doyle, Frank P.	(4)	✓ Lyman, Ed	(10)
✓ Drury, Aubrey (Historical)		✓ McLaren, John	(4)
✓ Dudley, Ernest	(7)	✓ McNoble, G. F.	(5)
✓ East, E. E.	(10,11,12)	✓ Mack, Miss M. E.	(10)
✓ Easton, Mrs. D. E. F.	(4)	✓ Mahan, Mrs. J. P.	(1)
✓ Easton, Robert	(9)	✓ Mensies, Robert	(4)
✓ Edmondson, Clyde	(1)	✓ Merriam, Lawrence	(4)
✓ Edwards, C. E.	(9)	✓ Merritt, Ralph	(7)
✓ Elliott, Harrison	(7)	✓ Metcalf, Prof. Woodbridge	(4)
✓ Evans, Mrs. S. C.	(1,11)	✓ Metzger, James	(10)
✓ Evermann, B. W.	(4)	✓ Moffitt, Jas. K.	(4)
✓ Eversole, Keith C.	(1)	✓ Monnette, Orra	(10)
✓ Farquar, Francis P.	(6)	✓ Moreland, Rt. Rev. Bishop	(3)
✓ Felton, Mrs. C. N.	(4)	✓ Morris, Edward	(1)
✓ Fernald, Reginald	(9)	✓ Mulford, Prof. Walter	(4)
✓ Files, A. W.	(8)	✓ Murphy, Fernand	(9)
✓ Fisher, Mrs. Robert	(1)	✓ Myers, Judge Louis W.	(10)
✓ Fleischman, Max	(9)	✓ Parsons, Mrs. C. E.	(3)
✓ Fletcher, Col. Ed.	(12)	✓ Petit, Charley	(9)
✓ Forward, John	(12)	✓ Pfau, Louis	(4)
✓ Fritz, E.	(1,2,4)	✓ Pomeroy, Hugh R.	(10)
✓ Fritzen, Theophil L.	(1,4,8)	✓ Pratt, M. B.	(3)
✓ Gabbert, J. R.	(11)	✓ Price, Francis	(9)
✓ Georgeson, F. W.	(1)	✓ Priesker, C. L.	(9)
✓ Goethe, C. M.	(3)	✓ Ramsey, Mrs. T. G.	(2)
✓ Greene, J. A.	(8)	✓ Howell, Chester	(4)
✓ Greig, T. A.	(1)	✓ Reynolds, G. Elmer	(5)
✓ Grunsky, C. E.	(4)	✓ Schloss, Mrs. A.	(4)
✓ Gundelfinger, Emil	(7)	✓ Shaffer, Richard	(7)
✓ Hawkins, W. I.	(8)	✓ Sheridan, E. M.	(7)
✓ Hine, T. W.	(1)	✓ Skutt, Gilbert	(10)
✓ Hotchkiss, Hal G.	(12)	✓ Sproul, Robert G.	(4)
✓ Howard, Mrs. H. G.	(2)	✓ Stanwood, Carolyn	(9)
✓ Howe, F. R.	(8)	✓ Stevenot, Archie	(5)
✓ Howe, Loren	(7,11)	✓ Stewart, Geo. W.	(3,7)
✓ Hoyt, Mrs. Sherman	(6,11)	✓ Stofen, Miss Meta	(4)
✓ Huber, Walter	(4)	✓ Sutherland, W. A.	(7)
✓ Huggins, Dorothy	(4)	✓ Tappen, Judge Clair S.	(10)
✓ Hunter, Mrs. Robert	(8)	✓ Tichner, Harry M.	(10)
✓ Hyde, H. A.	(8)	✓ Toy, Harvey M.	(4)



✓ Treanor, John	(10)	✓ Willaman, Glenn D.	(10)
✓ Tuomey, Miss Honoria	(4)	✓ Williamson, C. J. S.	(10)
✓ Wadsworth, F. E.	(11)	✓ Wishon, A. G.	(7)
✓ Wentworth, F. W.	(4)	✓ Wright, Curtis	(4)
✓ Welch, Hon. J. R.	(8)	✓ Wright, Mrs. G. R.	(4)
✓ White, Col. John R.	(7)	✓ Wright, Leroy A.	(12)
✓ Whitnall, Gordon	(10)	Young, Hon. Sanborn	(8)

3. Regional Reporters, selected after consultation with the above Advisers, were induced to undertake, without compensation, the making of special field examinations and reports on various regions within the State. A considerable number of the Advisers acted also as Regional Reporters and in addition to them the following:

✓ Adams, Owen S.	(Special)	✓ Enness, Geo. A.	(4)
✓ Balch, S. D.	(8, 9)	✓ Le Baron, C. A.	(4)
✓ Bennetts, R. J.	(8)	✓ McCormick, G. J.	(9, 10)
✓ Bigelow, Richard L.	(3)	✓ McKevitt, Mrs. F. B., Jr.	(4)
✓ Bremner, O. E.	(4)	✓ McLean, R. H.	(11, 12)
✓ Burr, Myron	(10)	✓ Merrill, M. Chester	(4)
✓ Camp, Chas. L.	(4, 8)	✓ Mills, J. W.	(4)
✓ Crusan, Harold Ide	(9, 10, 11)	✓ Murphy, Mrs. Walter	(4)
✓ DeForest, H.	(10, 11, 12)	✓ Murray, Mrs. Annie	(1)
✓ Doyle, Clyde	(10)	✓ Perkins, Albert	(10)
✓ Fleming, Guy	(11, 12)	✓ Purdy, Carl	(1)
✓ French, Harold	(4)	✓ Price, L. T.	(8)
✓ Goss, F. B.	(5)	✓ Schorr, W. Brier	(10)
✓ Hill, Arthur W.	(1)	✓ Sexson, J. A.	(10)
✓ Hjelle, Prof. Geo.	(10)	✓ Sherman, H. L.	(10)
✓ Hunt, C. H.	(11)	✓ Telfer, Thomas	(5)
✓ Isham, W. P.	(4, 8)	✓ Wheat, Carl I. (Historical)	

4. The purposes of the Survey were made widely known through the cooperation of the press, through public hearings held by the Commission, and through the activity of many civic and other organizations and committees, both local and statewide; and from these organizations and committees and from many individuals came a great quantity of suggestions and information, mainly as to specific pro-

jects for State Parks believed to be desirable, but also on matters of general policy.

5. Heartly cooperation was given by officials and employees of branches of the state and federal government, especially the other divisions of the Department of Natural Resources and the Division of Highways of the Department of Public Works, the Forest Experiment Station at Berkeley, the National Forest Service, and the National Parks Service.

As data came in from all these sources it was arranged and digested in the office of the Commission's able secretary and by the staff of the Survey, and followed up both by correspondence and by personal examinations in the field by Regional Reporters and by members of the staff. The examining and checking up on specific projects for State Parks suggested from all sources was systematic, and except that the limitations of time and funds made it in some cases more hurried and less thorough than would have been desirable it was tolerably complete.

As to the broader aspect of the Survey, calling for a general study of the resources of the State as a whole for enjoyment of scenery and of the pleasures of non-urban outdoor life, the results were somewhat less satisfactory. It was hoped that it might be possible through the volunteer regional reporters to make a general "drag-net" survey covering all parts of the State that would bring to attention all areas characterized by important resources of the kinds under consideration, regardless of whether they were previously well known or not, and systematic information as to the manner in which they are now being utilized and the manner in which they are being

conserved in some cases and destroyed in others. But although very valuable reports were secured from many of the reporters on specific questions referred to them in regard to specific localities and specific problems, especially in regard to definite projects for State Parks, too few of them had the time available or the previous experience necessary for making such a systematic general survey to cover more than limited areas. The conclusions in regard to that aspect of the Survey, therefore, have had to depend to a large degree upon the personal observations of the Director and the small technical staff, supplemented and guided by a mass of fragmentary comments and observations from the regional reporters and advisers, and by information obtained from technical organizations which have made systematic studies of special areas.

PART II - REVIEW OF THE SCENIC AND RECREATIONAL RESOURCES  
OF CALIFORNIA AND OF VARIOUS MEANS OF CONSERVING  
AND UTILIZING THEM, OF WHICH MEANS STATE PARKS  
COMPRISE ONLY ONE.

A. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS:

The magnitude and importance, socially and economically, in California, of the values arising directly and indirectly from the enjoyment of scenery and from related pleasures of non-urban outdoor life, considered in the aggregate and without regard to the means by which they are made available, are incalculably great, and in this summary are taken for granted.

Some conception of the variety and extent of the means by which these values are sought, and of the aggregate price at which they are valued by those who seek them, may be derived from a brief and partial enumeration:

(1) Automobile pleasure trips and tours.

Riding for no other purpose than enjoyment of the pleasant out-of-doors through which one passes, or with that as a controlling motive combined with some other purpose or excuse, is one of the "major sports" of California. Statistical measurement of its extent is impossible; but no less an authority than a member of the State Highway Commission has indicated his belief that half the travel on Cali-

ifornia highways is of this class. If so, substantially half the annual expenditures on the purchase, operation and servicing of California's 1,880,000 automobiles, and on the construction and maintenance of some 7000 miles of public highways is one item gladly paid for obtaining values of the sort we are considering.

(2) Other means of locomotion through pleasant scenery for the sake of enjoyment, as by rail, by boat, on horseback, or on foot.

(3) Commercially operated hotels, resorts, camps, eating places, stores, etc., used and supported by automobilists and others on their pleasure trips, and in localities where they stop for the prime purpose of enjoying outdoor life. Of this business also there are no adequate statistics, but it is enormous.

(4) Private vacationist dwelling places established and used solely or primarily because of the enjoyment obtainable by means of them, and mainly from the pleasantness of their outdoor environment; ranging from tents and little week-end and vacation cabins, in canyon or forest or at the seashore, to palatial country estates.

(5) That share of the passenger and freight business of common carriers, and that share of mercantile, manufacturing, agricultural and miscellaneous service businesses required for the creation, maintenance and operation of the above facilities.

(6) Other confessedly recreational uses (i.e. other than by automobile and by occupation of pleasantly situated temporary domiciles as above) of scenically agreeable places on the coast, in the mountains, in the forests, on streams and lakes, etc., (bathing, boating, fishing, and other outdoor sports, nature study, and just plain quiet enjoyment of one's outdoor surroundings) through substantially gratuitous use of lands not privately owned by the users. This includes

- (a) lands publicly held for such use (as Parks), and
- (b) lands held primarily for other purposes with which such use is not inconsistent (such as public forests and watershed lands, and such as timber- or grazing-lands, or vacant areas) which have agreeable landscapes and which the public enjoy either from neighboring roads or public places, or through being permitted to wander on them by sufferance.

Lands held as public parks thus appear only as one minor subdivision, fractionally minute in area, of the vast aggre-

gate of lands from which these scenic and recreational values are even now derived in so large a measure as to make regard for them an important factor in management.

The kinds of values sought by such means have always been part of the joy of living for many people; but in our time, in America, there has been an enormous increase in the proportion of people who have time left for the pursuit of such values after earning the bare necessities of existence.

These values \_\_\_\_ together with others which directly make life worth living, as distinguished from things which are valued only because they can be exchanged for something one really wants \_\_\_\_ are the final things which economic prosperity enables people to buy. In California today people are using their economic wealth in the ways above indicated to buy values of this particular kind enormously \_\_\_\_ incredibly to anyone of a former age or another country. And they will probably seek to buy this kind of values more and more.

How far such values can be bought, at any price, by succeeding generations in California will depend largely on the degree to which the physical conditions which make them possible are permanently conserved or are destroyed by the first comers through their wasteful methods of exploiting them.

The enormous development in California of the use of these scenic and recreational values of the out-of-doors has resulted in part from the economic prosperity of the people, leaving them time and means for such enjoyment, and in part from the lavish

abundance of naturally favorable conditions of landscape and climate.

But there are signs on every hand that because of this very abundance ( and of the increasing rate at which the favorable conditions are being put to use) careless, hasty, shortsightedly selfish methods of exploiting the natural assets of scenic value are rapidly killing the geese that lay the golden eggs.

To take a single type of this destructive exploitation: Every year thousands of "cabin-site subdivisions" and other residential and pleasure resort developments (of the type listed as (5) above) are being laid out in the pleasantest spots readily available as private speculations with the sole motive of making quick sales and "getting out from under"; and in a considerable proportion of cases in such a crowded and unsatisfactory manner that before half of the lots are actually put to use the natural advantages of the spot for such use are in large part permanently destroyed and the place tends to become a rural slum, in which the occupants fail to get in any satisfactory measure what they hoped and paid for. In every such case a good opportunity is wrecked, the more enterprising lot owners gradually abandon the blighted spot for a new venture in virgin territory, which in turn is apt to become similarly blighted because



those who determine what is done to it lack either the will or the skill to use the opportunity other than destructively.

The procedure is identical in principle with such destructive exploitation of natural timber resources as converts lands of potentially permanent timber productivity into useless barrens.

The most urgent concerns of the State in this connection are:

(1) to teach the great mass of well-intentioned people how to get what they want in enjoyment of scenic and recreational values, how to get it successfully for themselves now and on their own initiative, and how to get it without destroying the natural assets on which the continued enjoyment of such values depends; and (2) to curb and limit the activities of exploiters who would destroy the birthright of their successors, no matter what its value, for the sake of a quick turn of profit to themselves.

The first concern of the State, then, is one of public education, including:

(a) study and research as to the various good and bad methods by which the use of scenic and recreational resources is and can be carried on, and (b) getting the results of such knowledge across to the people.

The second concern of the State, in this matter, direct prevention of unwarrantably destructive exploitation of such resources, has many ramifications. The chief means of prevention are these:

(a) BY PROPRIETARY CONTROL:

(1) Parks. Peculiarly valuable scenic and recreational resources of any kinds which under private ownership and

management are peculiarly subject either to destructive exploitation or to a narrow monopolization which makes their enjoyment by the ordinary citizen impossible, can most simply and effectively be protected against wasteful abuse by means of their public ownership and management in perpetuity as Parks. To acquire and manage such parks is the prime function of the State Park Commission.

- (2) Other public holdings. Lands now held or which may come to be held by the State and its subdivisions and agencies, and by the Federal Government, primarily for other purposes than the conservation and use of their scenic and recreational resources, can, and obviously should, be protected against the unnecessary and wasteful impairment of such elements of scenic and recreational value as they contain by a proper and businesslike regard for these values as by-products in their public management; and in case of the alienation of such lands by establishing reasonable conditions and restrictions for ensuring a continuance of the same general policy. This is now the policy of the U.S. Forest Service in management of the National Forests, constituting the largest areas of publicly owned land in the State, amounting to nearly one fifth of its entire territory.

But there are many other public lands to which the principle should be systematically applied. The most fami-

liar and widespread of these are the lands of the highway system, the location and boundaries of which, as well as their physical treatment, should be determined in considerable measure, as is now well recognized by the Department of Public Works, by regard for the scenic enjoyment to be derived by the public from their use concurrently with their use for purely economic transportation.

Another notable example, as to which the principle has not yet been officially recognized is to be found in the tidelands. The State received from the United States, in trust for the people, the entire coast of California up to "ordinary high water", and still owns most of it. This is a vastly important area of publicly owned land, the administration of which intimately affects the scenic and recreational resources of the State.

In this connection the State Park Commission can and should collaborate, in consulting and advisory capacity, with the various responsible public agencies in charge of such public lands.

**(3) Protective restrictions or easements on private land.**

In connection with the creation of the better class of residential subdivisions in America there has occurred a notable development in the methods of applying a very old legal device, that of covenants entered into by the owners of land in regard to the manner of use of the land, to the end of guarding against forms of exploita-

tion injurious to the community. Methods have been found for making such covenants reasonably elastic and adaptable to changing conditions, instead of attempting to impose a rigid arbitrary control by a "dead hand" as in the old days; and with these improvements in technique the method has become a far more valuable and practical device. There have been some beginnings here and there of the use of this device by agreement between private landowners and public authorities; as where a park, parkway, or pleasure drive is laid out and constructed at public expense on a public right of way in a manner beneficial to the owners of abutting lands and the latter agree voluntarily, as a matter of public spirit, or of enlightened selfishness, to subject their land along the borders of this public improvement to certain covenants. These covenants provide that the land will not be used in certain specified ways detrimental to the value of the public improvement and to the general attractiveness of the region through which it runs, but are so drawn as not to interfere with uses of the land appropriate to the local conditions. Such covenants have often been entered into, for example, by landowners along a given stretch of highway requiring any buildings to be set back certain distances from the highway. In many cases, such agreements have been entered into for a nominal consideration, sometimes upon condition that similar easements are secured throughout the unit of highway in question; and in the latter case the required easements have

sometimes been acquired from a recalcitrant minority by condemnation in order to make the whole project effective.

By patience and tact in negotiation and by the application of adequate technical skill, a great many landowners in California can, I believe, be induced to enter voluntarily into agreements with public authorities that will safeguard the scenic and recreational resources of their neighborhoods from all the most seriously threatening dangers that attend wholly individualistic management.

(b) BY REGULATION UNDER THE POLICE POWER. To some extent, and under proper circumstances, it is practicable by public regulation to check some unnecessary and unreasonable impairments of the State's natural resources, such as are often caused by methods of exploiting private property which are needlessly wasteful or destructive of those resources.

In relation to scenic and recreational resources this can sometimes be done by more effective use of the now well-established method of public regulation of subdivision platting, and by extending and perfecting the operation of reasonable zoning regulations in regions where the permanent welfare of the community is clearly dependent on conserving its general scenic and recreational attractions and where the ill-advised exploitation of a few properties may not only conflict with the larger interest of the State in the region but

seriously depreciate the aggregate of private property values in the region itself. It is only the more flagrant cases of misuse of private property which can thus be definitely prevented; for it would be contrary to our American political and legal principles to emasculate individual initiative under guise of police-power regulation. But it often happens that the deliberate review and consideration of plans prepared on private initiative which is brought about by wholly reasonable police regulations of the kinds above mentioned gives opportunity for constructive education and leads to the voluntary adoption by the individual of much better development plans than would have been followed in the absence of such review.

¶ It is worth while to examine here in some detail two notable opportunities for the intelligent use of existing public proprietary control, existing primarily for other than park purposes (a 2 above), and of proper police regulation over related private property (b above).

First opportunity: THE TIDELANDS.

The State of California, and municipalities created by and holding from it, broadly speaking now possess title, in trust for the people, to the entire coast of California between ordinary high tide and low tide, and to the submerged lands beyond so far as that ownership can be made effective. ~~X~~ These so called tidelands are held in trust for the people's use in various ways, primarily in navigation. But the vast majority of them are so exposed and so conditioned that without prejudice to navigation they can and should be administered largely in the

interest of protecting the scenic and recreational resources so intimately associated with them. These public tidelands embrace a large and sometime the major part of the area directly used for recreation at beaches all along the coast. The manner in which their use is controlled and regulated, or left free from regulation, can profoundly influence not only the manner of use of these public lands but also the manner of use and development of the immediately abutting upland even when not publicly owned. At present, except in a few localities, no precise determination has been made of the landward limit of the State's tideland ownership, and no detailed supervision and control is exerted over the actions of abutting owners, who have in some cases, without permission from or supervision by the State, encroached upon its tideland property with pilings and buildings and artificial fillings to the detriment of the interests of the people for whom the State holds those lands in trust. XX

X It should be made the duty of some suitable agency, presumably the Department of Natural Resources, actively and systematically to protect the proprietary interests of the State in all tidelands not yet definitely assigned to specialized uses under specialized agencies, such as the Harbor Commissioners, to ascertain, survey, and firmly establish the maximum legal limits of the State's proprietary control; to study the use to which the various parts of these lands can most wisely and properly be put, — some for commerce; some for fisheries; some for

mineral wealth; some for combinations of uses in which recreation is an important part — ; and to provide for their proper administration and for the proper regulation of their use and prevention of their abuse by the general public and by abutting riparian owners. To that end there is need of legislation and of appropriations for actively protecting the State's proprietary rights. The values at stake along a thousand miles of almost unwatched tideland boundary, with many thousands of aggressive private neighbors ready to take an ell where they can get an inch, are too vast to be left longer without vigorous safeguarding.

Moreover it is the right and the duty of the State to bring about the establishment and enforcement of suitable police regulations governing the use of private land abutting on the public tidelands and the public highway of the ocean so far as is necessary to prevent such unreasonable dangers to the "safety, health, morals or general welfare of the people", which as are in fact liable to occur in the unregulated competitive use of separate parcels of ocean front land.



For example, an ocean beach, considered either as a geological structure adjusted by nature to withstand the impact of storm waves or as a place of human recreation, extends as a unit from beyond the seaward side of low-water surf to the upper limit or crest of the wave-washed material that forms the beach. But ordinarily this unit is owned partly by the State and partly by upland owners, with some very real overlapping of rights. When an attempt is made to fix a sharp boundary of these two "ownerships" the dividing line has traditionally been described by the Courts, broadly, as the line of "ordinary high water", usually interpreted as being the imaginary line of a mathematically computed "mean high tide"; but the rights of the two parties are not as sharply separated by this line as are the rights of two owners of upland real estate by the joint boundary. Where recreational uses of the coastal lands as a whole, including in such uses private dwelling places and commercial resorts, afford or are likely to afford the maximum values obtainable, as they largely do on the California coast, the natural resources of the locality can generally be used to far better advantage, at less economic cost, with less danger to property and life, and with larger returns to all ~~the landowners~~ concerned, if buildings and other structures are kept to the landward and safe side of the crest of the beach and if the entire natural unit of the beach is kept free to absorb the impact of storm waves and for recrea-

tional uses, ~~both private and public~~. Private developments along a beach usually begin in this sensible way, leaving the whole of the beach proper free from fixed structures. But when a subdivision separates ownership of the riparian edge from ownership of the back land, unregulated competition tempts to expansion of structures on the riparian edge seaward, occupying part of the beach, inviting danger and high construction costs, and greatly reducing the total values obtainable from the beach and the hinterland.

In such situations a police regulation fixing in advance a reasonable "front building line" for all private landowners, in the common interest and with proper provision for adaptation by a competent central authority to meet special local conditions, would prevent an immense final waste of natural resources.

To decree, as a condition of approving subdivision plats, that the now private portion of all ocean shores (that is to say, above "ordinary high water") shall be dedicated to public use for street or park purposes might be confiscatory and unconstitutional. But to decree that such private marginal lands along the beaches shall not be used for certain purposes to which they are naturally ill-adapted, which invite danger to property and life, and which tend to impair the potential aggregate values of property in the region as a whole, would be a

reasonable and far-sighted use of the State's police power; and in connection with suitable regulation of the public use of the State's portion of all beaches would leave it open to the State, at proper times and places, to acquire by gift, purchase or condemnation so much of the upper portions of the beaches, now privately owned, as it may prove expedient to have in public rather than in private ownership.

More definite suggestions for legislation on these lines will be filed with the Commission.

Second opportunity. THE LOWER SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES.

One of the most striking examples I have observed in California of the possibilities of conserving and utilizing scenic and recreational resources as a secondary but important incident of public control of land exercised primarily for other ends is in connection with the flood-plain portion of the Sacramento River and its tributaries.

For a distance of more than eighty miles, from Antioch past Sacramento to above Marysville, the river channels, together with marginal strips of flood plain, are enclosed by levees constructed by the State for flood protection. Along many of these levees there are roads, built and maintained by the State and by its agents, the counties. From the levees, by automobiles and otherwise, there are commanded delightful views of the river and its margins and of miles and miles of beautiful orchards and farming lands outside of and below the levees. The land within these levees is subject to special rights

vesting in the State for ensuring the free passage of flood waters, preventing dangerous obstructions and protecting the river banks and levees from erosion. The water channels themselves are subject to rigid public control in the interest of navigation by the Federal Government, and are used not only for freighting but largely by passenger steamers and pleasure boats. The situation is subject to further public control by the California Debris Commission, and must be still further controlled and managed by the State in carrying through the far-reaching public program of conserving and utilizing the Water Resources of the State. Along the course of this great system of waterways, levees and roads there are numerous delightful spots for recreation, and the route as a whole is in effect, even at present, a river parkway on a vast scale, of great landscape beauty, and enjoyed by thousands of people. *P* It is physically possible, while dealing successfully with the flood problem, with the commercial navigation problem, with the irrigation problem, and with the general conservation and utilization of agricultural and industrial opportunities, that events should take either one of two opposite courses in respect to the scenic and recreational assets.

On the one hand the roads along the levees may become gradually more and more shut in by structures and otherwise, and less and less agreeable, the marginal lands between the levees and the river more and more occupied by dumps and other unsightly conditions such as have already occurred in places, the trees become frequently destroyed where of great landscape value and allowed to grow up thickly where

open views are highly desirable, and in general the great scenic assets of this remarkable situation become gradually frittered away and the recreational use of the roads and of the river destructively exploited by a poor class of private catch-penny devices crowding close to the stream of travel.

On the other hand by a comparatively limited extension of the large degree of public control already established over the situation by the numerous public agencies concerned, and by the coordination of the policies, plans and methods of those agencies together with those of the State Park Commission, a situation which now offers admirable opportunities for scenic enjoyment by road and by water and many pleasant natural recreation spots along the river could not only be maintained but greatly enhanced in scenic value. Some of the methods by which this end can be sought are by opening and keeping open the finest possible views of river and meadow and woodland, by acquiring and improving a limited number of picnic places and camping places, and of natural parks on the flooded lowlands within the levees where not needed in connection with navigation or industry, and by prevention through appropriate zoning regulations of types of private use and misuse along the route injurious to the general welfare and to the aggregate property values of the localities into which they might be thrust by shortsighted or selfish individuals.

There are many other streams in California, both North and South, along which joint and coordinated management for flood control, for conservation and use of water, for highway transportation and for conservation and use of scenic and recreational resources, would bring far

greater dividends than the isolated pursuit of one or more of these ends alone. But the Sacramento River is the outstanding example among them and must suffice in this summary review.

Few Californians realize what a tremendous scenic and recreational asset it is capable of being made by an expenditure quite trifling in money alongside of all that has been spent and will be spent on unavoidable public improvements of the river and its margins. The need here, as in other parallel cases of less magnitude, is not so much for money as for painstaking co-operative effort; for vision to see where and how scenic and recreational by-products can be salvaged, and for technical skill in salvaging them economically.

I conceive that it is a proper continuing function of the Division of Parks to watch for such opportunities, call attention to them and try by consultation and advice to bring about the needful cooperation, for which the present organization of the various departments of the State Government is so much more favorable than in the past.

A third great system of publicly controlled lands acquired primarily for other than park purposes must here be briefly discussed in its relation to a prospective system of State Parks, namely the HIGHWAYS of the State.

The vast amount of enjoyment of the scenic resources of California which people get simply from riding in automobiles on public roads is essentially independent in most cases of the ownership of the adjoining lands. It has been well said that "the land belongs to its owner but the landscape to him who for the time being enjoys it."

Thousands of square miles of land in California privately owned but threaded by public roads, present beautiful landscapes which are possessed in this sense by the riders on the roads. These landscapes can be and are enjoyed in the highest degree by the public without trespass, and often without the slightest conflict between such public enjoyment and the private economic uses of the land. That is to say, it often happens that the land under its present economic use, for grazing or otherwise, offers as beautiful landscapes as could well be asked, admirably enjoyable from public roads and trails; and in such cases even if the aggregate value of the public enjoyment of the landscape is greater than the value of the land to its owners there would be little to gain and much to lose through withdrawing it from private use and public taxation by making it a public park, provided some other means can be found for avoiding impairment of the total aggregate values derivable both from the land and from its landscape.

The chief danger of such impairment lies in the fact that just

in proportion as the public is attracted by the pleasantness of such a region to use roads through it in large numbers, there arises a temptation to use the land abutting on those roads for new purposes, designed to exploit the presence of the pleasure-seeking public; purposes often parasitic in character and tending gradually to destroy the qualities which mainly induced the public to go there and justified the expenditure on the roads that brought them.

Suppose a new or improved road suddenly increases the accessibility, to week-enders, vacationists and tourists by automobile, of a lovely stretch of country, say a country largely occupied by grazing land and scattered woodlands of little economic value. News of its beauty and of the excellence of the road spreads like wild-fire. Pleasure travel grows by leaps and bounds; partly diverted from older routes, partly stimulated into existence by the new possibilities of enjoyment. The vast majority of the land is not and cannot be used for any other economic purpose than before and is raised but a fraction in its rentable and taxable value by the better transportation. But along the margin of the road there rapidly spring up new uses, partly parasitic on the pleasure traffic, partly serving real needs of that traffic; both too often done in places and in ways which progressively ruin the quality of the landscapes visible from the road. Speculative optimism causes a wholly unjustified multiplication both of the parasites and of the roadside services which in moderation were needful, so that competition alone tends to reduce the net earnings of most of them toward the vanishing point; while at the same time their multiplication spoils the attractiveness of the route, checks the growth of the pleasure



travel or begins to reduce it again, and sets the stage for diverting it to some other region not yet spoiled by such parasitism.

The wastes involved in such processes as these are greatly increased in frequency and in seriousness by the increased mobility characteristic of modern conditions, especially in America, and perhaps most of all in California. There is a weakening of factors which have often checked such wastes elsewhere and in the past, such as tenacious local traditions and habits, well-established local pride in things which have made a region famous, and a general blind resistance to any changes good or bad. New safeguarding factors need to be developed, and there is peculiar need and opportunity to develop them in California. They can be developed only by cautious but courageous and active experimentation along many different lines, for no simple, easy, panacea for these troubles has been devised, or is likely to be devised.

The creation of State Parks is one promising line of experimentation, but others are fully as important. The simplest way to indicate some of them is to take a hypothetical case of a new state highway through a region of beautiful landscapes but of moderate economic land values. It is assumed that the road<sup>is</sup> located and designed not only with regard to a proper balance of cost and efficiency in the road as a means of transportation between terminals, but with regard also to exhibiting the beauty of the landscape effectively; and that a right of way is secured sufficient to include, with some margin of safety, all the land necessary for construction and maintenance and for probable future widenings and improvements of the road. What more is desirable ?

1. Control of the foregrounds of the more notable and valuable landscapes enjoyable from the road, especially in those places where there is relatively great danger of great scenic loss through lack of control, and where the cost of insurance against that loss is low in proportion to what it buys. The selection of these places and determination of the kind and extent of control which will buy the most insurance at the least cost requires a high order of discretion. At one place, let us say, an inspiring outlook over miles of valley and mountain can be permanently assured by anything which guards against obstructive or distracting objects on a certain strip of land beside the road varying (say) from 55 to 150 feet wide. Less would not give the insurance, more is unnecessary. That insurance could be secured in various ways:

- (a) By a simple widening of the "right of way", and the maintenance of the area by or for the highway authorities.
- (b) By supplementing the highway by a "park" strip publicly owned and maintained, a procedure more likely to be justified if the strip can perform other park functions than mere control of the foreground of highway views.
- (c) By securing from the private owner of the strip (outside the portion necessary for the physical construction and maintenance of the road) an agreement, in the legal form of an easement, that he will not so use that strip as to blockade or impair the view across it from the highway, although free to use it in any other way. The precise wording of the grant of such an easement in order to meet the needs of any particular case — to accomplish the public purpose with a minimum of practical interference with the reasonable desires of the land owner —

sometimes requires much technical skill in respect to landscape and to legal considerations and in negotiation, but with patience could often be secured with little or no money payment as an incident and condition of locating the highway through that owner's land, or less favorably as a supplementary agreement.

(d) In some cases police regulations justifiable on other grounds as applicable to the use of lands adjoining a highway may reduce or avoid the need of acquiring such forms of foreground control as are noted above.

2. To provide for temporary stopping places, in the form of turn-outs, short spurs, or loops, for enjoyment of views in quiet, or for picnics; so arranged as to give a maximum of pleasantness and privacy to those who use them and a minimum of interference of such uses with the regular use and enjoyment of the highway by through travel and with the use and protection of adjoining private land. There is great need of systematic provision of such places along many California Highways. They must, from their nature, ordinarily be publicly provided, maintained and policed, because it is impracticable to provide and operate them as such at a profit. They must, therefore, be publicly owned. It is immaterial whether they are technically regarded as little parks or as incidents of the highway; but ordinarily the necessary slight maintenance and policing of them can most efficiently and economically be done as an incident of the maintenance and policing of the highway which they serve, and by the same force.

3. Areas adjoining the highway, of special beauty or other public interest, usually much larger than those of classes (1) or (2); embracing both (a) state or local parks intended for actual entry by the public for the better enjoyment of whatever special interest they present; generally including automobile parking facilities, often picnic places, and sometimes camping facilities; and varying enormously in size and in the qualities that give them special value, scenic, recreational, historic, scientific or otherwise; and also (b) areas valuable solely or chiefly for enjoyment from the highway in passing. These last will, in some cases, be so conditioned that the simplest and most economical way to assure the maintenance of what makes them of interest to the public passing on the highway is to acquire the land for park purposes and manage it at public expense solely for that purpose; but in many such cases it should be possible, by the exercise of ingenuity and initiative, to secure the essential public purpose in view at a lower cost to all concerned through agreements with the private owners, leaving to them the possession and exclusive use of the land, but guaranteeing against destructive changes in the things which make the area one of notable public interest and concern.

In the course of this Survey, in traversing California highways largely used for pleasure travel, I have observed a great many cases where the pleasure derived from the use of the highway was very largely dependent upon the condition of certain critical strips and fragments of private land, upon which a few unfortunately placed sheds or advertising signs or trees or even bushes could almost completely obstruct or ruin the view from the highway of distant landscapes of great

beauty.

In some of these cases the natural growth of vegetation on these parcels would in time close out these views. In other cases the cutting of a few foreground trees for fuel or otherwise would greatly impair the highway landscape. In most of these cases the present economic value of the landowners' right to do or permit the things which would work such injury to the landscape is little or nothing. If the facts were called to their attention, some, doubtless, would capitalize the "nuisance value" of these fragments of their land and try to blackmail the public by threat of committing the injuries; but I have sufficient confidence in the decency and public spirit of the majority of Californians to believe that if properly approached they would gladly execute properly drafted agreements, for themselves and their successors in title, to avoid these needless and serious injuries to the scenery of the highway where to do so would not involve really serious economic losses to them.

And to supplement such voluntary grants, in regions where it is widely recognized that the general welfare and even the economic prosperity of the inhabitants and landowners of the region as a whole are largely dependent on the maintenance of its attractiveness to people seeking pleasant outdoor surroundings, at least the more indefensible selfish abuses of the privilege of abutting on a scenic highway can be controlled by local zoning regulations, if they are framed under competent technical advice, legal and otherwise.

I have not included the provision of overnight camping places as a normal public function incidental to highways used for pleasure travel. No such camp that is much used can be kept in sanitary, decent and agreeable condition without considerable equipment and constant

maintenance and care, for which the users should reasonably pay a fair charge. There is, therefore, no sharp line of demarkation between the operation of such camps and the operation of hotel; and private enterprize tends to supply them in a great variety of types, all subject to regulation and inspection by the Board of Health. It appears to me that there are just two conditions under which the State would be justified in establishing public camping places and operating them directly or through lessees; where a State Park or kindred public recreational area established for other reasons is so situated that it cannot be adequately enjoyed by the public without the convenience of proper provision for camping in connection therewith; and second, perhaps, where the adequate enjoyment by the public of an agreeable stretch of country made accessible by state highways appears to require provision for camping in localities and under conditions which make it unlikely that the need will be satisfactorily met by private initiative.

B - DISTRIBUTION AND CHARACTER OF THE MORE NOTABLE RESOURCES  
OF THE STATE OF SCENIC, RECREATIONAL AND RELATED KINDS.

A map of the State has been prepared to accompany this report indicating in a broad way the general distribution of many of the resources under consideration.

While the fundamental elements determining the characteristics of scenery are geologic — the land forms, the soil and rocks, the water — the most significant single criterion of landscape conditions which can be shown on a small scale map, in addition to streams and large bodies of water, is the distribution of the various types of natural vegetation.

On this map are shown the regions throughout the State characterized by each of the following types of natural growth. The map is based mainly on the much more detailed but as yet unfinished surveys of the Forest Experiment Station at Berkeley, supplemented in some areas by much more superficial observations. No distinction can be made on this scale between virgin forests and second growth or cut over areas, and no attempt is made to show areas of any type less than a township in size.

Redwood Forests. This comprises the noble forests of the "redwood belt", including many admixtures of Douglas Fir, Madrone, and other trees, beside the pure stands of redwood groves, and the richest and most beautiful undergrowths of all the California forests.

Big Tree Groves. The locations of all the more important stands of the Big Trees of the Sierras are shown by symbols.

Pine Forests. The areas grouped under this designation, although mainly characterized by pines, vary greatly in composition and in density in different parts of the State. All are regions of "tall timber" and of sylvan beauty.

Douglas Fir. These are outliers, in the northern part of the State, of the greater Douglas Fir forests of Oregon and Washington, often in nearly pure stands. As an admixture in other types of forest, the Douglas Fir is much more widely spread.

Fir Forests. These forests, mainly composed of red and white fir, mark generally higher levels in the mountains than the "Pine Forest".

Alpine Forests. These are the forests of still higher mountain slopes, up to timber line, varied and picturesque, but often of little timber value.

Woodlands. This term is used to cover a great variety of growths, mainly characteristic of the foot-hills and the fringes of forest regions, of relative little timber value but often of great landscape charm. Oaks of many kinds, both evergreen and deciduous, are the most prevalent trees, sometimes in close groves, but often more widely scattered through grass land and chaparral in the beautiful park-like landscapes which are among the most charming and characteristic elements of California scenery. Digger pines are



common in some of the woodlands, and others, especially toward the deserts, are largely of Juniper.

Brush land. "Woodland" and "brush land" merge one into the other imperceptibly, and from the purely landscape standpoint much that has been rated as "brush" by the foresters might be counted as beautiful though dwarfish woodland. "Brush" also includes much bushy chaparral in the southern part of the State, but low and opener bushy growth, at all approximating sage brush land in appearance, is classed with grazing land and desert.

Blank areas on the map include the latter kind of low brush land, grazing land, deserts, and lands dominantly agricultural. Within these blank areas occur in places many fragments and passages of woodland and other scenery of considerable interest, which it was impracticable to record, except that some of the desert regions of special interest are designated by symbol.

Throughout all these regions of different vegetation, the quality of the scenery varies largely with the local topography. This is impossible to generalize; but ~~in addition~~ the most notable scenery and the most favorable opportunities for recreation are often associated with streams, lakes, and the ocean, or with mountains, canyons, buttes, or outstanding rocks.

The main types of these scenic resources can most conveniently be discussed in groups similar to those under which specific State Park projects will be discussed below.

### SEA COAST.

The regions along the line of contact between land and ocean, both on the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts of the United States, because of their scenery, their climatic conditions and the variety of enjoyments to which they are adapted, constitute one of the great scenic and recreational resources of the continent, drawing people in constantly increasing numbers from the prosperous but less agreeable vast interior.

The coast of California differs climatically from the Atlantic coast mainly in that the movement of air is almost constantly from off the cool sea, making the temperatures far more equable throughout the year and in general refreshingly cool even in the "vacation season" of summer, when most of the fertile and populous areas of the interior, both of California and of the continent as a whole, become unpleasantly hot.

The temperatures which characterize the California coast, the year round are most nearly represented on the Atlantic side by the summer climate of the coast of Maine, a climate which in combination with picturesque scenery has made that coast a summer resort of national importance in spite of two drawbacks, which are also shared by the coast of California, namely the prevalence of water temperatures which most people find uncomfortably cold for bathing, and a tendency to fogs. Both these drawbacks are increasingly noticeable as one passes up the coast from San Diego to Del Norte Counties. The California beaches, of which there are hundreds of miles although less continuous

than those of the Atlantic coast south of the Gulf of Maine, are and will be used, because of the water temperatures and often too heavy surf, proportionately less for actual bathing and swimming and proportionately more as refreshing seaside playgrounds than those of corresponding latitudes on the Atlantic coast. On the other hand, the extraordinarily equable and refreshing climate of the entire belt of sea coast land which feels the influence of the sea breezes, accompanied by the immensely diversified and beautiful character of the coastal landscapes — alternating between beaches and rocks; plains or lagoons and dunes, mesas or mountains; open fields or chaparral slopes and woodlands or forests; with the land often rising tier on tier in sight of the sea for miles inland — makes a trip along almost any part of this coast, or a sojourn on it whether brief or extended, far more refreshing than is generally the case on the Atlantic coast. Moreover during the heats of summer, these conditions tend to make a broader belt of seaboard land naturally attractive for enjoyment and refreshment of city and inland dwellers, than is the case on the Atlantic with its prevalence of summer breezes off the hot interior and its prevaillingly flat topography.

An important conclusion to be drawn from these considerations is not only that California has vast resources of scenic and recreational values along its hundreds of miles of coast — that is a fact which everyone knows. More specifically it is that in the utilization of these resources there is great danger of waste through following the line of least resistance in the subdivision and occupation of the sea coast lands in such a way that a limited number of people will skim

the cream of sites along the outermost edge of this coastal belt and in the process greatly depreciate the values otherwise obtainable from the belt as a whole, both by those who would later occupy residential sites and resorts near but not directly on the sea, and by the vast numbers living in the interior who will want to enjoy the coastal belt by means of brief excursions.

I am not one of those who would like to see the entire non-commercial sea coast of California made into a public park and kept free from dwelling houses, even if it were financially practicable to bring this about. I believe that one of the desirable ways for millions of people to use and enjoy this natural asset is by occupying cottages, hotels, clubs, and the like, along the coast. I would not even wish to see such dwelling places uniformly and everywhere separated from the shore by an automobile road across which their occupants must pass to reach the water's edge. But it is perfectly clear that a long continuation of the sort of developments which have recently been taking place along the coast, especially in Southern California, without any systematic general planning for the future, would result in a ill-balanced and relatively unprofitable use of a great natural asset. Specifically it would result in:

(1) A disproportionately small, indeed an absurdly inadequate, provision of facilities for enjoyment of coastal scenery by automobile, which is the chief way in which it is likely to be seen and enjoyed by a large proportion of the citizens of California and of visitors to the State. The present tendency is plainly toward the gradual progressive

walling off of nearly all the agreeable views of the sea and shore from the coastwise highways by buildings and other developments on private land.

(2) A crowding forward, especially upon the beaches, of private structures of a sort and in a manner which are sometimes dangerous and which tend greatly to diminish the value of the beaches for enjoyment, (a) by other occupants of beach front property (b) by occupants of neighboring upland property (c) by the general public which has very positive rights to the use of a large part of every beach; rights for which the State is trustee and which it is the State's duty to safeguard.

(3) A disproportionately small provision for convenient and agreeable means of access for the public to the portions of beaches and other shores in which they have rights, and inadequate and unsatisfactory provision for the parking of cars by which they reach these points and for various conveniences and comforts needed for the reasonable enjoyment of the shores.

(4) An irritating and confusing conflict of complicated and little understood public and private rights in various parts of the beaches at various stages of the tide, unsatisfactory both to the public and to owners of riparian land.

(5) A tendency toward the initial development of too continuously urbanized (and often slummiy urbanized) narrow shore fringes, to the great detriment of the total scenic, recreational, and residential values otherwise obtainable from the entire coastal belt.

One important measure toward counteracting these tendencies is the acquirement and management, in perpetuity, as non-urbanized public parks, of considerable stretches of coast of various types, including beaches, especially in Southern California where the urge to use the coast for recreation is stronger than in the north and where the attempts to exploit this urge, often in a shortsighted and publicly injurious manner, are now most active.

Another is to bring about much better and more far-sighted regional planning of the steadily progressive subdivision, re-arrangement and utilization of that far greater extent of lands in the coastal belt which will, and should, remain in private ownership, — planning so as to avoid the wasteful frittering away of the great values involved.

It is impossible in this report to discuss adequately the varieties of coastal scenery throughout California, but a few regions of the coastal belt will be discussed in more detail in connection with specific state park projects.

#### FOREST AND WOODLAND TYPES.

Undoubtedly the forests of California are among its most notable scenic assets. Outstanding among them and unique in all the world are its Redwood Forests with their characteristic undergrowths, and its groves of Big Trees. Only less notably unique in beauty than these are its primeval forests and woodlands of certain other types.

With minor exceptions the forests of California, unlike those of the East, never extended over much land fit for agriculture, and

with good economic management they will be perpetuated where they stand. But not as they stand. These venerable forests, made up in part of the oldest, largest and most impressive of all living things, when once cut will probably never more be seen by man \_\_\_\_ not though our remote descendants live on in a California of unchanged climate thousands of years longer than it has taken to grow the trees we see. For to let trees grow so old and large is "uneconomic" as a matter of timber growth.

This generation has received, as a free inheritance from past ages, a hoard of forest wealth. Regarded as economic or exchangeable wealth, not carrying a normal rate of interest, it calls for liquidation; and it is being liquidated by lumbering operations just as fast as it can be pushed on to a somewhat glutted market. But if any of the future generations for thousands of years to come are to have opportunity of enjoying the spiritual values obtainable from such primeval forests, this generation must exercise the economic self-restraint necessary for passing on some portion of this inheritance, instead of "cashing-in" on all of it.

A glance at the map shows how considerable a part of the forested regions of California is included within the boundaries of National Forests and National Parks. There is much private land within those boundaries, but slowly and gradually, by a process of trading and purchase, the government holdings in the Forests are being consolidated; and a beginning has been made on the vitally needed acquirement of the much fewer private holdings inside the National Park boundaries.

The Federal Government has thus already set apart in California for permanent public administration forested areas largely available for free public recreation that are more extensive than the combined State Parks and State Forests of any State in the Union. It is important to consider, therefore, under what circumstances and for precisely what reasons the State is justified in purchasing and administering forest lands as State Parks.

Most of the timberlands within National Forest boundaries, whether now privately owned or owned by the Government, will sooner or later be cut over and operated as perpetual-yield timber-crop forests, having, it is true, large incidental recreational possibilities; but not retaining the scenic and inspirational qualities peculiar to the virgin forests of huge and venerable trees.

There are some important exceptions to this general rule.

Recreational Areas in National Forests are definitely set apart from time to time by the Secretary of Agriculture on recommendation of the Forest Service in localities where scenic and recreational values are of dominant importance, and are thereafter managed substantially for the same purposes as if they were parks. Some of these include notable stands of big timber.

Wilderness Areas in the National Forests are in process of being set apart by similar administrative action in localities now unpenetrated by roads, where there are practically no privately owned lands, where roads are unlikely ever to be needed for fire-fighting or other



administrative purposes, and where natural wilderness conditions can be maintained in perpetuity; but these areas, while of immense recreational value to those who will pay the price of effort, by which alone the true wilderness can be enjoyed, are most often high mountain areas and seldom include heavy stands of timber.

Special Withdrawals in the National Forests, have been made of limited areas, most often about a square mile in extent, embracing typical examples of various kinds of natural forest with the intention of keeping them permanently in their natural condition, primarily for scientific study and as a check on the results of experiments elsewhere. These are in effect museum specimens of many of those types of forests which happen to occur on National Forest lands.

The National Parks, for those forest areas which they include, do as much as State Parks would be likely to do.

BUT IN RELATION TO THE FOREST SCENERY OF CALIFORNIA AS A WHOLE AND ITS ENJOYMENT BY THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE THERE ARE NOTABLE SHORTCOMINGS IN THIS GREAT SYSTEM OF NATIONAL RESERVATIONS.

1. The most notable and serious is that the great Redwoods, California's noblest forest heritage, lie almost wholly outside the National Forests, having been acquired by private owners before the latter were set apart. To preserve adequate and worthy examples of virgin Redwood forests is by far the most important and urgent single duty of the State Park Commission in relation to forest types.

2. The Big Trees of the Sierras, occurring only at rare and scattered localities, are in larger proportion now included in National

Parks and National Forests and in all such cases permanently protected; but a few notable examples not so protected cry out for protection by the State.

3. Certain other examples of beautiful, inspiring and botanically important types of forest and woodland growth characteristic of California are, by accidents of geographic distribution, not well represented and preserved in the national system of reservations, and these too call for action by the State.

4. In relation to the use and enjoyment of the scenic resources of the National Forests by the public of California two classes of problems arise calling for special consideration by the State.

(a) Many parcels of land which passed into private ownership before the National Forests were created, or which have since so passed, mainly under color of mineral claims, constitute keys to the public enjoyment of parts of the Forests having great scenic or recreational value or are so situated that their exploitation in private hands might seriously impair such values. In so far as these private lands are valuable mainly for timber production they are gradually being consolidated in National Forest ownership; but in so far as their value is mainly or exclusively for the recreation of the people of California the burden of acquiring them is not a legitimate charge on the National Forests, and in some cases their acquisition for State Park purposes seems the most desirable course, with a provision for subsequent readjustment of boundaries by exchange with the National Forest Service so as to produce satisfactory administrative units.

(b) The resort to parts of the National Forests of pleasure seekers in concentrated numbers, drawn mainly from the population of California, creates problems of sanitation, of policing, and of providing many kinds of facilities and conveniences, necessarily involving large expenditures. Congress has shown no disposition to provide at all adequately for these expenditures at the cost of the general taxpayers of the nation, and it would seem probable that this condition must be met in one or both of two ways: (1) by the transfer in some cases of the burden of administering these recreational areas in the National Forests to State, County, and local authorities, as has already been done in a few instances, and (2) by the establishment of a suitable system of charges through which those who avail themselves of these special facilities shall pay much or all of the costs involved in providing and administering them. To encourage concentrated recreational use of public lands, whether forested or otherwise, without squarely meeting the cost of thoroughly adequate administration is simply to invite destruction of the natural assets and justifiable dissatisfaction on the part of the public.

TYPES VARIOUSLY COMBINING LAKE, STREAM, WOODLAND AND TOPOGRAPHIC INTEREST, other than those associated with National Forests and in most cases now privately owned.

Such areas are distributed widely throughout the State in great variety. Most of them will and must remain in private ownership, and in such ownership can continue to contribute largely to the enjoyment of scenery and to recreational use. The State's concern with

their future; except so far as they may properly be included as parts of a State Park System, has already been discussed.

The chief criteria for determining which of them should be included in an "ultimate, comprehensive State Park System", as in the case of the less miscellaneous groups, appear to be these:

1. They should be sufficiently distinctive and notable to interest people from comparatively distant parts of the State to visit and use them, not merely good enough to attract people from the region in which they are situated because of the absence of more interesting areas within easy reach. Also they should in general be situated beyond the limits of urban and suburban communities which have sufficient population and wealth to assume the obligation of providing parks mainly serviceable for the daily use of their own citizens, even though of incidental value to people of distant communities.
2. They should be characterized by scenic and recreational resources of kinds which are unlikely to be reasonably well conserved and made available for enjoyment under private ownership, or which under private ownership are likely to be so far monopolized as to make it seriously difficult or impossible for the ordinary citizen to secure enjoyment of them, except at a cost in time and money disproportionate to their cost of providing that enjoyment through State Parks.
3. They should be as nearly as possible just sufficient in number and extent and character to meet the prospective demands of the people for the kinds of enjoyment which they can provide, and which cannot or will not be supplied by such other means as local parks, National Parks and Forests, and the use of scenic highways. The gauging of that demand in

47

advance is very difficult; but there is every indication that it will be much greater than can be provided for under the present bond issue.

4. They should be geographically distributed with a view to securing a wide and representative variety of types for the State as a whole, and at the same time making a reasonable assortment of them equitably accessible to the people in each part of the State.

"Equitably accessible" in respect to State Parks obviously does not mean that if one community has a state park within half an hour's ride every other community should have one equally near. A State Park System cannot be laid out on that scale of accessibility. It means more nearly that a fair assortment of State Parks should be within the reach of a day's travel by automobile of any considerable body of population.

DESERT TYPES. Certain desert areas have a distinctive and subtle charm, in part dependent on spaciousness, solitude, and escape from the evidence of human control and manipulation of the earth, a charm of constantly growing value as the rest of the earth becomes more completely dominated by man's activities. This quality is a very vulnerable one. Its bloom is easily destroyed by comparatively slight changes made by man. The very conditions which make a desert what it is leave every man-made scar upon its surface so completely unsoftened and unobscured by natural processes<sup>as</sup> to produce a<sup>rapidly</sup> cumulative deterioration of its precious wildness.

The desert is in general worth so little for any other purpose than occasional enjoyment of its untamed character, and so much of

it in southeastern California is within easy reach by automobile of so large a population, that it seems a clear duty of the State to acquire and preserve inviolate several desert areas large enough for future generations to enjoy in perfection the essential desert qualities. As in the case of the ancient redwood forests, only such public action by the present generation on an adequate scale can preserve this heritage for the people of centuries to come. Nowhere else are casual thoughtless human changes in the landscape so irreparable, and nowhere else is it so important to control and completely protect wide areas.

On the map some of the regions of special desert interest are indicated by symbols.

Areas of other special interest, historic, scientific and otherwise.

The places of historic interest brought to attention by the survey are broadly of two sorts: Those marked by buildings or other objects of intrinsic architectural or picturesque interest having historic associations, and those which have historic interest merely because of some event which is associated with the site but which left no substantial physical reminder.

In general I believe that the latter can best be dealt with by the erection of suitable tablets or markers, with or without public acquirement of land for a setting; and except when such a site is worthy for other reasons of being made into a State Park its acquirement and ad-

ministration hardly seems to be an appropriate function of the State Park Commission.

In the case of historic objects, such as buildings, the case is different. There is sometimes urgent need of action to protect them from disintegration or vandalism and where they are of statewide interest, and local or private initiative is unlikely to take the necessary steps for their preservation, the State ought to do so. Here again, if the prime object which the State has in view, — namely, the preservation and respectful treatment of the historic object and reasonable opportunity for the public to see it — can be satisfactorily accomplished by agreement with the owner or owners, without the State's taking title to the property and assuming the entire burden of caring for and protecting a small isolated unit, this course will often be the wiser. But there are some cases where the only practicable course is for the State to take title to the land, to repair and protect the object, give it a suitable setting, and permanently safeguard it, all of which involves considerable annual expense without much possibility of securing any corresponding revenue in any dignified and legitimate way.

Much the same may be said of certain objects of archeological interest, remains of Indian culture now neglected and seriously subject to destruction by thoughtless vandalism, and to various isolated objects of special scientific interest, geological, botanical, zoologic and otherwise.

On all of these special subjects this survey has had to rely mainly upon information volunteered by specialists, and I do not feel that

the information obtained is as yet sufficiently comprehensive and systematized. Certain fairly definite recommendations are made below, but the subject deserves further study.



### PART III. DISCUSSION OF SPECIFIC STATE PARK PROJECTS

Projects for upwards of 320 distinct and separate State Parks have been placed before the Commission and studied by the Survey staff, and data in regard to them filed with the Commission under corresponding file numbers grouped in twelve geographic districts.

The number of projects is stated approximately because in some cases it was a matter of arbitrary choice whether to treat two or more proposals as distinct and separate projects or as variants, alternatives, or more or less separable parts of one project.

Coming from so great a variety of sources as they do the projects naturally vary from offers to sell land which the owners or agents think there might be a chance of unloading on the State (sometimes with little appreciation of the qualities which might make land desirable for State Park purposes), to well-considered projects of the utmost importance, put forward in a public spirited way and with an excellent understanding of the needs of a State Park System.

In digesting, classifying and considering this mass of projects the first step is a process of elimination.

Independent opinions have been sought as to all of the projects from the members, 175 in number, of the Advisory Groups, and while the opinions expressed in this report are my own and rest on a much more comprehensive study than that of any member of the Advisory Groups, I find that my opinions are confirmed in most instances by the consensus of judgment of these Advisers so far as definitely expressed. In all cases where the judgments so expressed are not unanimously or by a

substantial majority in accordance with my own, I call attention to that fact in the detailed tabulations submitted with this report.

For purposes of discussion I first reduced the number of projects slightly by consolidating about 15 of them, some of which are important, urgent and quite fit to stand alone on their own merits, with larger and more comprehensive projects that will be recommended for favorable consideration.

Next I recommend the initial elimination of 171 projects for one or more of the reasons stated below:

Eight projects mainly or wholly because they lie within the limits of incorporated municipalities and are therefore excluded by law from the scope of the State Park System;

Ninety-eight projects because clearly subject to one or more of the following objections:

1. Definitely lacking in qualities suitable for a State Park.
2. Definitely more of local than of statewide value.
3. Too small or isolated or both to justify acquirement and administration by the State in the absence of more notably outstanding qualities.
4. Manifestly <sup>too</sup> costly in proportion to their value for State Park purposes.
5. Distinctly less valuable as State Parks than other projects which would serve similar purposes.

Sixteen projects for reasons closely analogous to those above mentioned, but not falling precisely under the wording there used.

(a) Five projects which, while not lying within the boundaries of incorporated municipalities are surrounded by or closely adjacent to such municipalities and are well within the limits of the metropolitan

agglomerations of San Francisco or Los Angeles, occupying land of relatively high price and so situated as to be serviceable mainly for local daily use by those metropolitan populations, thus falling into a class of metropolitan urban parks logically indistinguishable from the case of parks within municipal boundaries normally excluded by law from the State Park System.

(b) Eleven projects which if situated in some other part of the State would have considerable distinction, but which do not stand out sufficiently from their local surroundings in view of their probable cost, or which embody features more or less satisfactorily represented in other projects that are more advantageous, or which can clearly be deferred for some years without much danger of loss.

Fifty-one projects primarily because (1) now part of a National Park, adequately protected and open to public enjoyment, or (2) included within the boundaries of a National Park and legitimately the duty of the National Government to acquire and administer as part of that park, or (3) part of a National Forest wholly free from included private holdings and reasonably protected as to scenic and recreational values, or (4) within a National Forest and presenting no condition, either as to included private holdings or otherwise, that would seem at present to offer any justification for creating a State Park within the Forest, or (5) now held and protected by some other public or quasi-public agency and clearly not in urgent need of action by the State.

In addition I would withdrawn from immediate consideration: Eight projects for the fencing in and preservations of certain species of animals, which projects should be referred to the Fish & Game Commission before passing on them;

Also twelve projects and groups of projects closely associated with State Highway rights of way and four projects within the proposed limits or of the Kennett Reservoir, all of which should be referred to the Department of Public Works before passing on them.

There remain about one hundred twenty-five projects for favorable discussion in this report. All would be worth including in a comprehensive State Park System if possible, and with others much less urgent would make a well-balanced system. But it is perfectly obvious that they could not all be acquired by the State without spending several times the six million dollars of the present bond issue unless much more than half the market value of the properties is contributed from other sources.

It is also desirable for a time to hold certain amounts in reserve for possible use in connection with some of the projects referred for consideration by other divisions of the state government and for other border line cases.

It will, therefore, be necessary before proceeding with acquisitions under the bond issue to select still further among these listed projects. The principles which should control these selections are discussed below.

## SEA COAST PROJECTS.

There are two sea coast projects that do not fall into groups with others.

POINT LOBOS, file number 5700, Monterey County, four miles south of Carmel. The most outstanding example on the Coast of California of picturesque rock and surf scenery in combination with unique vegetation; including typical Monterey Cypress. The entire point between the highway and the sea, comprising over 400 acres, is highly desirable; the most essential part of the point is considerably smaller.

SANTA CRUZ ISLAND, file number 6150, Santa Barbara County. The most notable of the islands off the coast of Southern California in respect to vegetation, scenery, sea-caves and running water, rising to 2400 feet elevation. Good fishing, boating, bathing. About 24 miles long, about 90 square miles. About 24 miles off shore from Santa Barbara.

Lower Southern Sea Coast Group.

SOUTHWEST BOUNDARY PARK- SILVER STRAND, file number 7<sup>56</sup>55, San Diego County. Beach and bay frontage. Five miles of barrier beach between Pacific Ocean and San Diego Bay, and five miles more of beach backed by extensive lowlands, marshes, lagoons, and some hills.

hills, extending to the Mexican border at the Southwest corner of the United States.

ESTUARY BEACH PARKS, file number 7530, San Diego County. A series of beaches, together with valleys, at the mouths of which they lie, with inland water, meadows and enclosing hills, in part wooded. Several areas between San Juan Capistrano and San Diego with from one to five miles of beach each.

In the same stretch of coast with these Estuary beaches, there are some narrow strips of land between the State Highway and the sea, some with and some without beaches, which ought to be acquired either as additions to the highway right of way or as State Parks. (Note. The southernmost of the "estuary beach projects", adjoining Torrey Pines and clearly desirable as a park in extension of Torrey Pines, is eliminated by law because within the City limits of San Diego, as is also the case with Mission Bay, where the State's ownership of tidelands should be used to assist San Diego in establishing a local park.)

LAGUNA BEACH PARK, file number 6800, Orange County. Sandy beaches and bluffs with large areas of adjoining hill land, two small lakes, a pleasant canyon, and the long northeast arm of Newport tidal inlet, valuable for small boating and water sports. 50,000 acres or less depending on amount of hill land secured. Northeast and southeast of Laguna Beach for several miles, excepting the town of Laguna Beach

and other subdivided lands.

Upper Southern Sea Coast Group.

MALIBU COAST, (westerly part), file number , Los Angeles County.

A series of beaches, with bluffs and mesas, alternating with valley mouths, backed by the Santa Monica Mountains and traversed by the new State Highway along the coast, extending eastward from the Ventura County Line.

(Projects for State Parks on the easterly part of the Malibu Coast are regarded as within the Metropolitan Suburban Zone of Los Angeles, as are others along the coast between that point and Newport).

POINT MAGU AND VENTURA COUNTY BEACHES, file number 6450, Ventura County. Beaches, lagoons, small dunes, and flat lowland abutting against bold hills at southeast side of Santa Clara delta and extending toward subdivided areas near Hueneme.

RINCON BEACH, etc., file number 6275, Ventura County. Several beaches, of which Rincon is typical, with narrow strips of private land between State Highway and ocean, beginning to be occupied by cabins.

GAVIOTA PASS, file number 6115, Santa Barbara County. Beach, valley-mouth, picturesque rocks, canyon and live-oak valley rising to pass, on State Highway. Historic interest. Adjoining Santa Barbara Na-

tional Forest.

PISMO BEACH, file number 6175, San Luis Obispo County. Some fifteen miles of excellent broad, sandy beach backed by dunes, with lowland and lagoons.

MORRO BAY, file number 6225, San Luis Obispo County. Large shallow sandy bay with extensive State tidelands, enclosed from ocean by peninsula of high dunes. Picturesque pinnacle of Morro Rock arising from sea at entrance to bay, owned by the United States. Several miles of good beach north and south of Rock. Much subdivision and some building along north beach and landward side of Bay.

Middle Sea Coast Group.

CAPE SAN MARTIN BEACH, file number 5517, Monterey County. Beach coast and scenery. Extent indeterminate.

MOSS LANDING BEACH, PARK, file number 5683, Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties. Ten mile stretch of pebbly and sandy beach with flat land behind, from point 2 miles south of Capitola to Pajaro River. Bathing and marine views. Several thousand acres available.

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY BEACHES, file number 5820, Santa Cruz County. Various beaches along coast of Santa Cruz. Sandy and pebbly. Several miles.



PESCADERO BEACH, file number 3825, San Mateo County. Beach one mile long, fronting a land-locked lagoon and marshland. Abrupt, pebbly bluffs. Good fishing. About 100 acres, 2 miles from Pescadero.

Northern Sea Coast Group.

BODEGA BAY, GALLAGHER RANCH and JOY WOODS, file number 3600, Sonoma County. Includes Bodega Bay, inner and outer shores, beaches, notable dunes, and strip of land between ocean and County coast road, reaching from Bodega Bay northward to the mouth of Russian River a distance of 12 to 16 miles. Also strip of land four miles inland from ocean along Salmon and Tannery Creeks to connect with Gallagher Ranch and Joy Redwoods at Bodega. Fishing, boating, bathing, camping, hiking. Historical site of Russian settlement. About 3000 acres.

PT. REYES PENINSULA PARK, file number 3777, Marin County. Hilly, forested, mesa, canyon, beach and bluff lands fronting on Drakes Bay, Pacific Ocean and Tomales Bay. Scenically fine. High recreational potentialities. Embraces several subordinate projects.

GUALALA RIVER PARK, file number 2155, Sonoma & Mendocino Counties. Coast at mouth of Gualala River and lower part of north and south forks. Redwoods. Scenically beautiful. Well suited to general

recreation. 2000 to 3000 acres, including part of north and south forks and mouth of Gualala River.

RUSSIAN GULCH, file number 2305, Mendocino County. Partly redwoods, some cut over land, creek and beach lands. Botanic interest considerable. Views, excepting at ocean front, not outstanding. Fishing and picnics. 1600 Acres. Ten miles south of Fort Bragg, extending from Pacific Ocean front about four miles inland.

FRESHWATER, STONE AND BIG LAGOONS, file number 2115, Humboldt County. Notably beautiful lagoons, with their barrier beaches. Interesting woodland scenery on landward sides of lagoons. Haunt of wild fowl. Camping, picnics, fishing, boating and bathing - general recreation. Several park units of considerable extent to be selected along and near Redwood Highway, 30 to 45 miles north of Eureka.

#### REDWOOD FOREST PROJECTS.

##### Northern Group.

COMPLETION OF HUMBOLDT STATE REDWOOD PARK, file number 2150, Humboldt County. Redwood groves, mixed forest and undergrowth of outstanding beauty and associated stream and valley landscapes along and near South Fork of Eel River, Eel River and tributaries, desirable to round out

and complete as far as practicable the detached groves of the present State Park by control and protection of the scenic beauty of the region along the Redwood Highway in which those units have been established, and by extending it northward especially in the notable Bull Creek and Dyerville Flat region.

PRAIRIE CREEK PARK, file number 2200 - Humboldt County. Redwood forest and creek lands and possibly coastal lands to round out the present Russ Grove and other State Park areas along Prairie Creek. Notable redwoods and undergrowth. General recreational potentialities. From junction of Prairie and Redwood Creeks northerly to Humboldt-Del Norte County Line.

DEL NORTE COAST PARK, file number 2250, Del Norte County. Notable redwood, mixed forest and coastal views. Undergrowth luxuriant. Botanical and geological interest. Hiking and picnics. Desirable for amplifying the limits of the present Graves Grove, and to preserve an unmarred approach to it from the north and south. About eight to fourteen miles south of Crescent City and extending from Redwood Highway to the Pacific Ocean.

MILL CREEK- SMITH RIVER PARK, file number 2300, Del Norte County. Notable stand of redwoods and heavy undergrowth. Excellent forest

and river scenery. Camping, picnics, fishing. Botanically interesting. Desirable for preserving an unbroken forest picture through a region of outstanding worth. Extending from a point in Elk Valley, four miles northeast of Crescent City to the new bridge on the Smith River and including several miles of river frontage and Redwoods along the River and on Mill Creek.

VAN DUZEN RIVER PARK, file number 2325, Humboldt County. Noble redwood groves. Interesting for exceptional views along river. Camping, fishing, bathing and general recreation. 1200 to 1600 acres. Extending 10 miles easterly along the river from a point one mile east of Carletta.

MONTGOMERY REDWOOD GROVE, file number 2190, Mendocino County. Notable redwoods; first growth, cut over in part. Interesting for recreation, especially picnics, camping and fishing. 800 Acres. In Montgomery Gulch, about 16 miles northwest of Ukiah.

JOSHUA HENDY GROVE, file number 2177, Mendocino County. 480 Acres. Excellent recreational possibilities. Exceptional first growth redwoods. Along Navarro River 30 miles west of Ukiah, close to the McDonald to the Sea Highway.

#### Southern Group.

ADDITIONS TO CALIFORNIA REDWOOD PARK, file number 5510, Santa Cruz

County, San Mateo County. Timbered canyons, ridges and slopes north and west of Big Basin. Redwoods and mixed conifers, excellent stream and interesting small falls. Camping and hiking. 2 1/2 hours from San Francisco. 12,000 acres.

FELTON GROVE, file number 5600, Santa Cruz County. Impressive grove of fine redwoods, adjoining forested hills, wooded stream and open meadow. 375 acres. Six miles from Santa Cruz on San Lorenzo Canyon Road.

SAN MATEO REDWOODS, file number 3810, San Mateo County. 612 acres of first and second growth redwoods, mixed forest, open and grazing lands on headwaters of Harrington Creek, 4 miles north of La Honda and 3 miles west of Skyline Boulevard. Botanical and recreational interest. Topography rather steep.

BIG SUR, file number 5725, Monterey County. Timbered canyon, including redwoods, sheltered from coastal fogs and winds. Big Sur River. Several springs and resort. Fine climatic conditions - camping, hiking and fishing. 1200 acres. 38 miles south of Monterey on Carmel-San Simeon Highway.

HEARST TRACT, file number 5630, Monterey County. Timbered Canyon

and headwater of Little Sur River. Redwood and mixed conifers. Hiking, camping and fishing. 1200 acres. Twenty seven miles south of Monterey. 9 miles east of Carmel.

#### BIG TREES.

CALAVERAS GROVE, file number 4100, Calaveras County. North and south groves of Big Trees, privately owned within the Stanislaus National Forest. The former one of the most impressive and earliest known groups of Big Trees; the latter associated with notable Sugar pines and mixed forest. Congressional grant for State Park purposes of considerable area of less excellent intervening forest is conditional on State acquiring one or both groves. Beautiful mountain stream of Stanislaus River flows between the groves. Maximum area about 6000 acres. Twenty-three miles northeast of Angels Camp.

REDWOOD MOUNTAIN, REDWOOD CANYON, file number 5250, Tulare County. One of the very best stands of Big Trees, with stream running through it. 4700 acres, more or less, privately owned timberland within Sequoia National Forest.

TULE RIVER, SEQUOIA PARK, file number 5260, Tulare County. Reported to contain <sup>many</sup> good Big Trees. Investigation not completed. Near Tule River Indian reservation.

# OTHER PROJECTS WITHIN NATIONAL FORESTS.

Here also there are two projects which cannot well be grouped with others; both of them important and urgent.

KING'S CANYON, file number 5117, Fresno County. One of the most notable scenic canyons in the Sierras, into which the State is now building a road. The private land in the canyon should clearly be acquired for State Park purposes and an agreement entered into with the United States Forest Service, which controls all the rest of the land in the canyon, for dealing with the administrative problems which will arise on the completion of the road.

SAN JACINTO MOUNTAINS, file number 7300, Riverside County. Virgin timber and rugged peaks. An outlying and isolated southern representative of conditions characteristic of the Sierras. View of surrounding country from summit and fine view of desert from Hidden Lake. In Cleveland National Forest. Alternate sections owned by Southern Pacific with some private holdings besides. Important that entire area still in a wilderness condition, above the region now occupied by resorts, should be publicly controlled as a wilderness unit. North of Hemet, South of Banning.

There is a northern mountain wilderness project, the conditions of which are in some respects parallel with the San Jacinto project, but as to which my recommendation is different, namely

CASTLE CRAGS WILDERNESS, file number 2566, Shasta County. A mountainous area extending many miles west and southwest from Dunsmuir, marked by picturesque crags with high mountain lakes in western part. Within Shasta National Forest. Private ownership extensive, alternate sections Southern Pacific; but exploitation not imminent and general acquisition of these included private holdings can reasonably be deferred for more urgent projects. Good approaches from Pacific Highway to National Forest through private land outside of Forest are greatly needed, however, and their acquisition is somewhat urgent.

Lake Group.

LAKE GROUPS.

LAKE TAHOE, file number 3100, Eldorado County. Lake-view forested areas bordering shores of Lake Tahoe, all within boundaries of Tahoe National Forest.

(a) Eldorado County Thirteen hundred feet of Lake shore, sandy beach and sparsely timbered land. County owned; adjoining El Tahoe property. 60 acres.

(b) Baldwin-Brigham Lake frontage between Tahoe City and Brookway. Privately owned.

(c) Fish Hatchery Two hundred feet Lake shore and sparsely timbered area. Camping and lake view. Owned by State.

(d) Tahoe Realty Company One thousand feet Lake shore and timbered



area between highway and lake. Lake views and camping. 80 acres.  
Privately owned.

(e) Bliss Memorial Scenic Rubicon Point and craggy shores including small sandy beach. Timbered and of rough topography. 162 acres in trust for gift to State. Tahoe City and Emerald Bay.

(f) Talent Lakes Six miles above Rubicon Point. Fine high Sierra lakes and forest. Camping. 800 acres.

DONNER LAKE, file number 3155, Nevada County. Lake shore and timbered land east of Lake near area of historic monument of Donner Party. Variously proposed to include from 1500 to 12,000 acres. In Tahoe National Forest but largely in private ownership, especially on shores of lake. Two miles west of Truckee on Auburn-Reno Highway. Camping and boating.

BLUE LAKE, file number 2560, Lassen County. Beautiful Mountain Lake, and timber; 6000 ft. elevation. Within Modoc National Forest, but privately owned. 435 acres. A key situation. Thirty miles south of Alturas. Fifteen miles east of Madeline.

ZACA LAKE, file number 6475, Santa Barbara County. Beautiful high mountain lake surrounded by mixed forest. 320 acres private land. Surrounded by Santa Barbara National Forest lands. Ten miles off State Highway between Los Olivos and Los Alamos.

ECHO LAKE, file number 3200, Eldorado County. High Sierra Lake with timbered shores. Gateway to largely used Desolation Valley area set

aside for recreation by Secretary of Agriculture in Eldorado National Forest. North end of lake one mile from summit of Placerville-Tahoe Highway. 116 acres. Privately owned within Eldorado National Forest.

GOLD LAKE, file number 3250, Plumas County. High Sierra Lake and timbered region for camping, boating and fishing. 681 acres. Privately owned within Plumas National Forest, in largely used Lake Basin area set apart for recreation by Secretary of Agriculture. Eleven miles north of Sierra City; seven miles by good road from Yuba Pass and seven miles south of Blairden on Western Pacific Railroad Company.

It is convenient to group with the above a small mountain project not on a lake.

GROVER'S HOT SPRINGS, file number 4200, Alpine County. High Sierra timbered slopes and canyon. Popular camping place and hot springs. 200 acres. Privately owned within Mono National Forest, three and one-half miles west of Markleeville.

#### Waterfall Group.

WATERFALL GROUP

EXTENSION OF BURNET FALLS STATE PARK, file number 2505, Shasta County. Contiguous to one of the most beautiful falls in California, now a State Park. Extension of 3000 acres includes frontage on Lake Britton and streams for camping and fishing. Within Lassen National Forest

but mainly privately owned. Present park 335 acres. Ten miles north of Burney and from Redding-Alturas Highway.

FEATHER FALLS, file number 2571, Butte County. One of the most beautiful falls in State. Attractive camping areas included within 3000 acres. In Plumas National Forest but 160 acres patented. Two miles north of Moorstown; twenty-two miles from Oroville.

#### LAKE AND RIVER PROJECTS (independent of National Forest areas)

CLEAR LAKE REGION, file number 3585, Lake County. Attractive, hilly, wooded and beach lands adjoining the western shore of Clear Lake, mostly in peninsula, known as Hotaling Estate. About 1260 acres, useful for general recreation. Excellent views. Also minor opportunities elsewhere on shores of Clear Lake.

SACRAMENTO RIVER, file number 3437, Sacramento, Solano and Sutter Counties. Suggestion for conserving scenic and recreational values as by-product of other public activities relating to flood plain portion of Sacramento River and tributaries, as discussed above in this report.

#### MOUNTAINS, BUTTES, ETC. (independent of National Forest areas)

MT. DIABLO, file number 3775, Contra Costa County. 5000 to 6000

acres of open, brushy or partly forested lands in Pine Canyon and on the slopes of Mt. Diablo. To amplify and round out the small State parks already preserved at the summit.

MT. ST. HELENA, file number 3770, Napa and Sonoma Counties.

Mountain summit, forested, brush covered and volcanic lands on the slopes of Mt. St. Helena, 4500 acres. Views fine. Botanical, geological and historic interest. Includes Robert Louis Stevenson Monument and Russian Monument.

HOWELL MOUNTAIN, file number 3700, Napa County. 800 acres on the east side of Howell Mountain, east of St. Helena. Yellow Pine, Fir, Madrone and brush lands and creek. Capable of connection along ridge to Mt. St. Helena project.

PIONEER MEMORIAL PARK, file number 3460, Butte County. Scattered timber, brush and pasture land in Marysville-Butte region. Historic and scenic value. Picnics. 500 acres or more. Six miles west of Live Oak.

FREMONT PEAK, file number 5625, San Benito County. Bold peak, 3100 foot elevation where American flag was first raised in California in 1846. Valley views and historic interior. 100 to 200 acres. Ten miles west of Hollister and 10 miles south of San Juan.

THE PINNACLES, file number 5650, San Benito County. Impressive colorful rock masses and scattered pines, north of and adjoining present National Monument. 160 acres. Roads from Soledad and Hollister.

**MINOR PROJECTS of WOODLAND and/or TOPOGRAPHIC INTEREST.  
(independent of National Forest areas and of  
State Highway projects)**

Several small but intrinsically desirable projects, distributed in various parts of the State, and embracing typical woodlands of live oak and other kinds and very interesting rock and land forms, most of which there is prospect of preserving at relatively trifling cost to the State, have been favorably considered and will be covered by a separate memorandum to the Commission; but I am not satisfied that we have found all the most favorable opportunities, and it seems best not to make the list public pending further field study and negotiations.

**DESERT PROJECTS.**

PALM CANYON, file number 7250, Riverside County. The best known and most frequented of palm canyons including the original Washington Palms, near Palm Springs. Partly Indian lands and partly private lands. Difficulties which in the past have prevented a proposed transfer of these Indian lands to National Monument status may interfere with their acquirement for State Park purposes; but it is

urgently important, either by that means or by some other arrangement acceptable to the Indians and the Government, to provide for the public policing and care of the canyon, now subject to serious danger from vandalism, from fires, and from general carelessness, and also to bring the private holdings under public control.

PAINTED CANYON, file number 7275, Riverside County. Rugged walls of colored rock bordering desert, with interesting desert vegetation. Near Mecca. Alternate sections Southern Pacific and public domain.

RED ROCK CANYON REGION, file number 5200, Kern County. One or more areas of desert mainly unpatented public domain several square miles in extent including notable Joshua Trees and other typical desert vegetation. Special features within this region are Red Rock Canyon, showing remarkable erosion forms and color (but now largely in private ownership) petrified forest, and Walker's Pass.

BOREGO PALM CANYON REGION, file number 7575, San Diego County.

An area of many square miles near the northeast corner of San Diego County, including palm canyons and the desert mountain escarpments descending toward Borego Valley, and including also the more interesting desert portions of the San Felipe Valley.

SANTA ROSA MOUNTAINS AND SALTON SEA REGION, file number 7325, Riverside, Imperial and San Diego Counties. Desert slopes and canyons of Santa Rosa Mountains, extending down to limits of cultivable land

along Imperial Valley Highway, including much of the old sea shore markings near base of mountains, and including also one broad stretch of desert plain reaching to Salton Sea. Associated with and preferably connected to the Borege Palm Canyon region.

EDOM PALM CANYON REGION, file number 7115, Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. A Palm Canyon near Edom and Mecca, together with many square miles of desert plateau, mainly in the public domain, extending northerly from it to Twenty-nine Palms. Varied in character from small valley where Edom palms are located to high plateaus with Joshua Trees and a large variety of desert vegetation with interesting rock forms.

LOST HORSE VALLEY, file number 7200, San Bernardino County. Upland desert with surrounding mountains west of the northern part of the preceding.

MORONGO PASS DISTRICT (Devil's Garden), file number 7225, San Bernardino County. An area of special interest for its varieties of cactus and other desert vegetation. Northeast of Whitewater adjacent to Imperial Valley Highway on the approach to the two preceding.

VICTORVILLE JOSHUA TREES, file number 7450, Riverside County. Large groves of Joshua Trees and other desert growth near State Highway southwest of Victorville.

## PROJECTS OF HISTORICAL AND OF SCIENTIFIC INTEREST.

### Extensions

FORT ROSS ADDITION, file number 3607, Sonoma County. 100 acres or more, to include the harbor, cove, ocean front and creek to round out and protect areas of historic interest now owned by State. On ocean front nine miles north of mouth of Russian River.

MARSHALL MONUMENT PARK EXTENSION, file number 3407, Eldorado County. Site where gold was discovered in town of Coloma. Historic value. American River landscape and picnics. 20 acres or more in extension of existing small State park. Nine miles northwest of Placerville. Enlargement.

### Pioneer Group

COLUMBIA TOWN, file number 4120, Tuolumne County. Old mining town of great historic and picturesque interest. Four miles north of Sonoma. This old town as it stands today is the most interesting, picturesque and historically valuable monument of the early mining days of California which has been found in the course of the survey. Its physical characteristics should be preserved in perpetuity mainly by suitable agreements entered into between the State and the property owners and in part by purchases, and also by the public's assistance in financing and supervising necessary repairs, restorations and care.

SHASTA TOWN, file number 2900, Shasta County. Small old mining town.



First Masonic Lodge in State. Five miles west of Redding on Redding-Weaverville Road.

PIONEER MEMORIAL PARK and DONNER LAKE PARK, referred to under previous headings, belong fully as much in this historical class except that they contain no important physical remains of the historic events associated with them.

MARK TWAIN'S HOME, file 4230, Tuolumne County. Restored cabin one mile from Tuttletown on road to Jackass Hill. One acre and cabin owned by Tuolumne County. A few acres additional are desirable to preserve the pleasant foothill woodland setting and to provide for picnics, etc.

#### Spanish Group

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY MISSIONS, file number 6280, Santa Barbara County. Certain of the abandoned old spanish missions which will rapidly disappear if not protected from further decay.

CAMULOS RANCH, file number 6111, Ventura County. Old Spanish ranch house of historic interest. In Del Valley. 10 acres.

DE LA GUERRA RANCH, file 6120, Santa Barbara County. Of historic interest. Near Santa Barbara.

VALLEJO HOME, file number 3975, Sonoma County. 300 acres, hillside, brush and rocky land in ranch form. Home of General Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo. Property partly within limits of City of Sonoma.

Not only in the cases listed in the two preceding groups but in several others, such as buildings of old Fort Tejon, in a pleasant setting along the Ridge Route, action by the State to protect their historic and picturesque interest, either by purchase or by securing protective easements while leaving the property in private hands, would be fully justified where the results can be accomplished at reasonable cost.

#### Archeological and Scientific Groups

As in the case of neglected remains of buildings of historic interest belonging to the Spanish and the Pioneer periods, there are many more or less valuable and interesting remains of Indian culture and objects of other scientific interest, which in the absence of any protection are seriously in danger of loss to the State through careless vandalism and irresponsible pilfering and relic-hunting. The more notable of these are here listed but others have been recorded and more will doubtless be reported later. The cost of purchasing or of securing protective easements from the landowners would be, in most cases, trifling, and the cost of such measures as fencing, posting signs and systematic inspection would be well justified.

PAINTED ROCKS, file number 6185, San Luis Obispo County. Historic Indian paintings. Near Carrizo Plains, eastern San Luis Obispo County. 5 acres of grazing land.

SANTA BARBARA PICTOGRAPH, file number 6279, Santa Barbara County.

Of archeologic interest. Difficult of access. 10 acres. In mountains north of Santa Barbara.

FISH TRAPS, file number 7140, San Bernardino County. At line of old seashore where Indians formed rock basins to hold fish as tide receded. Near Berdels corner, west of Mecca. Privately owned, but owner interested in making arrangements with State that will safeguard permanent preservation in the public interest.

SHELL MOUNDS, in various localities, notably in Tulare County, containing records of Indian culture which should be preserved intact unless and until excavated under competent archaeological supervision for public museums. Now subject to irresponsible and unrecorded private digging.

PETRIFIED FOREST, file number 3778, Sonoma County. About 100 acres on Santa Rosa-Calistoga Road,  $3\frac{1}{2}$  miles west of Calistoga. Probably the best of the several petrified forest deposits in the State for scientific and popular interest. At present well protected by private owner and open to public inspection at a reasonable charge.

It is almost impossible to state succinctly and without danger of misapprehension the principles which should control the choice, and order of precedence for acquisition under the authorized bond issue, of the projects above set forth, because the weight to be given to different considerations varies widely in different cases.

The principle easiest to state and of most general applicability is that every dollar of the bond issue money should be used to secure the largest possible values for the State. This means, of course, that as between two or more projects of which only one can now be carried through the cost of the land to the State, in relation to its value for park purposes, must be a controlling consideration. That cost will be the price (not in excess of its market value for other purposes) at which the land can be obtained, by agreement or by condemnation, less the contributions (not less than half of the price to be paid) which are offered from other sources. A project for which the lands are offered at a low price, in relation to the park values which the project offers, or for which contributions in excess of half the price are offered from sources other than the State must have the preference.

In the general survey of the entire field an attempt has been made to keep an eye on probable costs, and balance them against park values, but in many cases the figures of probable cost obtained are not at all dependable. It will, therefore, be necessary in many

cases, in order to assure getting the greatest possible values for the State's expenditure, to carry negotiations with land-owners and prospective contributors through to quite definite figures on several alternative projects before taking title to one of them, often involving surveys and preliminary landscape studies for the manner of using and administering a prospective park in order to determine the most expedient boundaries, and also appraisals of market value. These negotiations will take time and money; some of them will lead to no definite result, except the extremely important negative one of avoiding purchases that seem desirable at first blush, but would later prove injudicious. There is no dodging the fact that twelve million dollars of trust funds cannot be efficiently spent without considerable precautionary overhead expense.

Next, the selections must be such as will provide a reasonable geographic distribution and a reasonably well-balanced variety of kinds of parks; but some departure from an ideal balance of the different kinds and locations of parks desirable in a complete system may well be countenanced in the expenditure of the funds now available, for the sake of giving a measure of preference to the more urgent "now-or-never" types of projects, on the theory that other types, which are perhaps equally desirable intrinsically but the opportunity for acquiring which will remain open for some years, may be added later.

The grouping of the projects in the above list was dictated partly with regard for the above considerations. It would have been desirable to arrange all of the worthy projects in such groupings that I could say a well-balanced system would result from acquiring those projects in each group which prove to be most advantageously obtainable, in as large a proportion within each group as the limit on total expenditures permits, without omitting representation of any one of the groups. I can go so far as to say that I believe substantial acquisitions should be made in each one of the geographical groups into which the Sea Coast Projects and Redwood Forest projects are divided, the former involving a large preponderance of heavy expenditures in Southern California and the latter a large preponderance of heavy expenditures in Northern California; that substantial acquisitions should be made respectively in the Big Tree group, in the Desert group, in the Lake group, in the Waterfall group, and in the Lake and River Projects; and that as well-distributed and extensive acquisitions as possible should be made among the more miscellaneous projects listed under the other heads. The projects under the more miscellaneous headings do not lend themselves readily to formal groupings, either geographic or functional, such that a representative selection of the most feasible projects in each group would automatically result in a well-balanced selection. There will inevitably be some elimination of projects which prove not to have



sufficient popular appeal to make possible the raising of contributions for matching the State's money. And for the rest, while I have some opinions as to relative urgency and relative importance in a well-balanced system, these opinions must be weighed and balanced in each case against considerations of cost as determined by practical negotiations with money in hand and power to decide and act. Final responsibility must rest upon the Commission, acting judicially upon information and advice presented by its executive officer and other responsible agents, and seeking in all promising cases to balance cost against the qualities of intrinsic excellence, of importance as contributing to the well-balanced variety of the ultimate park system, of urgency or danger of total loss through delay, and of reasonably equitable geographic distribution.

# OLMSTED BROTHERS

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS

BROOKLINE·MASSACHUSETTS

WESTERN OFFICE

FREDERICK LAW OLMSTED  
JAMES FREDERICK DAWSON  
PERCIVAL GALLAGHER  
EDWARD CLARK WHITING  
HENRY VINCENT HUBBARD

TELEGRAMS  
REDONDO BEACH  
CALIFORNIA

PALOS VERDES ESTATES  
CALIFORNIA

January 9, 1929

Mrs. Laura E. Gregory, Secretary,  
California State Parks Commission,  
650 Mills Building,  
San Francisco, California.

Dear Mrs. Gregory:

This is just to put on record the fact that  
there are due from me, as confidential supplements to  
the State Parks Survey report,

- (1) a discussion of certain projects relative to  
State Highways, etc., intended for transmission to the  
Department of Public Works;
- (2) a discussion of certain projects intended for  
submission to the Fish and Game Commission;
- (3) a listing and discussion of certain "Minor  
Projects" not listed by name in the main report.

The doing of these will simply have to wait until  
after I get back from the hospital.

Sincerely yours,

*F. L. Olmsted*  
2.



File numbers of the lists referred to  
under (3) in attached letter include the follow-  
ing (though this list is not fully complete or  
checked over) 6200, 7525, 7875, 4700, 4510, 7125,  
5260, 5525. *Alabama Hills*  
*California*  
*Rocky*  
*Rocky*

# OLMSTED BROTHERS

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS

BROOKLINE·MASSACHUSETTS

WESTERN OFFICE

FREDERICK LAW OLMSTED  
JAMES FREDERICK DAWSON  
PERCIVAL GALLAGHER  
EDWARD CLARK WHITING  
HENRY VINCENT HUBBARD

TELEGRAMS  
REDONDO BEACH  
CALIFORNIA

PALOS VERDES ESTATES  
CALIFORNIA

Feb. 20th, 1929.

Mrs. Laura E. Gregory, Secretary  
California State Parks Commission,  
650 Mills Building,  
San Francisco, California.

Dear Mrs. Gregory:

I enclose, at last, a list of the projects file numbers which I consolidated with others for purposes of consideration in my report.

To this I have added lists of the projects eliminated, for various reasons, from immediate consideration. The latter lists are my only record of these by file numbers. I suggest that you have several copies typed, on thin paper of a size which can be pasted as inserts in the printed report, that you send me two copies for my files and that you paste the others into the Commission's office copies of the printed report for convenience of future reference.

In Group I the typed sheet has "5550 Castro House" but I notice that a rough pencil memo sheet which was attached to the typed sheet has in place of that "5560" (without a name attached). I don't know which is right. Is there a 5560 and if so what is it?

Sincerely yours,

*Frederick Law Olmsted*

Enclosures;

# GROUPED WITH OTHER PROJECTS

Original File Number	Transferred to File/ Number
✓ 2160 - Coombs Property (Purch. S.R.L.)	2150
✓ 2170 - Devoy Redwood Grove	2150
✓ 2182 - Hammond Lumber Company addition to Humboldt Redwood Park	2150
✓ 2185 - McMeekan Property	2150
✓ 2187 - Lane Memorial Grove Addition	2150
✓ 2188 - Highway Parks	2195 and others *
✓ 2307 - South Fork of Eel River	2150
✓ 2475 - Webber Property	2300
✓ 3400 - Old Channel Park	3437
✓ 3608 - Gallagher Ranch	3600
✓ 3735 - Joy Woods	3600
3750 - Little Lakes	3777
3808 - Russian Monuments	3770
3815 - Robert Louis Stevenson Monument	3770
5633 - Hoover Ranch	5510
(6450 - Ventura County Beach Park.) ✓	**
6545 - Highway Parks	*

Grouped with Other Projects -2-

\* Several of the groups of suggestions which came from people in the Division of Highways and were filed en masse under such headings as "2188 - Highway Parks" or "6545 - Highway Parks", included suggestions relating to areas or ideas substantially identical with those of projects which had been suggested from other sources and which have file numbers of their own. I have not recorded all these duplications and cross references. I think 2188 and 6545 were two such files which had nothing in them not properly covered by various other file numbers. The other "Highway Parks" files need to be checked over for such cross references, and to see what remains after these duplications have been referred to their proper project files.

\*\* Ventura County Beach Parks and Point Magu <sup>6190</sup> were consolidated but 6450 is apparently the number retained for the consolidated file. The other is the one eliminated.

I.

~~Next I recommend the initial elimination of 8 projects~~ *eliminates*

mainly or wholly because they lie within the limits of incorporated municipalities and are therefore excluded by law from the scope of the State Park System:

2154 - Fort Humboldt ✓

3575 - Coyote Point ✓

3845 - Sonoma Plaza

5550 - Castro Home

J-580?

6807 - Los Angeles River Park ✓

6925 - Redonda Beach ✓

7580 - Mission Bay ✓

7600 - Torrey Pines. ✓

2

II. 98 projects because clearly subject to one or more of the following objections:

1. Definitely lacking in qualities suitable for a State Park.
2. Definitely more of local than of statewide value.
3. Too small or isolated or both to justify acquirement and administration by the State in the absence of more notably outstanding qualities.
4. Too costly in proportion to their value for State Park purpose
5. Distinctly less valuable as State park than other projects which would serve similar purposes.

2100 - Ed Chapman Property	2695 - Orland Park
2172 - Fort Bragg Redwoods	2800 - Quincy Park
2140 - Buhne Point	3115 - Cisco Flat
2184 - Mad River Beach	<sup>3 4/35</sup> 3485 - Pyramid Peak
2183 - Lake Leonard	3150-- Crystal Cave
2152 -Cowell Memorial Park	3105 - Ahlf Grove
2186A- Klamath River	3107 - Brighton-Perkins Camp Ground
<del>2105 - Navarro Redwood Park</del> <i>Olunief</i>	3160 - Dutch Flat
2205 - Knight's Ranch	3440 - Taylor Ford
2304 - Redwood Creek	3475 - Sutter's Mill (Historical)
2320 - University Grove	3515 - Black Walnut Park
2306 - Shelter Cover	3570 - Camp Taylor
2181 - Scandoff Tract	3605 - Chevy Chase
2315 - Ukiah Mill Creek	3606 - Elim Grove
2610 - Kelly's Resort	3620 - Glenn Oaks Ranch
2574 - Klamath Indian Village	3776 - Napa Redwood Park
2689 - Moss Falls	3779 - Purissima Woods
2690 - Lake Lena Park	3801 - Niles Canyon

3675 - Emily B. Hopkins Redwoods

3803 - Palestine Grove	5225 - Rocky Hill Park
3804 - Putas Rancho	5270 - Natural Mound Park
3820 - Paradise Ranch	5295 - Sequoia Gigantea Park
3855 - Tucker's Grove	5300 - Sequoia Ridge Big Trees
3865 - Tunitas Glen	5310 - Shaver Lake
3895 - William King Ranch	5560 - Cypress Point
3980 - Vallejo Tide Lands Park	5636 - Hoge Park
3610 - Geyser's State Park	5670 - Mill Creek Park
3680 - Highland Springs	5675 - Little Sur Redwoods Cost
3603 - Chile's Flour Mill	5690 - Partington Canyon Park "
3685 - <i>Hooker Home</i>	5695 - Palo Colorado Park "
3698 - Jack London's Home	5800 - Soquel Redwoods "
3830 - Pomo Indian Village	6110 - Atascadero Scenery Lakes
3990 - Yount Mill	6180 - Point Conception
4275- Natural Bridges	6195 - Protero Valley
4233 - Milliken Bridge Park	6350 - Simi Hills Park
4210 - Fremont's Ranch	6440 - Van Ness Canyon
4235 - Miwok Indian Village	6460 - Wonderland Park
4533 - Fales Hot Springs	6520 - Arcadia Park
4535 - Mono Hot Springs	6575 - Santa Monica Mountains
4750 - Panamint Mountains	6585 - Monrovia Peak
4510 - Alabama Hills	6645 - North L.A.Co. Antelope Park
4530 - Death Valley	6650 - Puddingstone Lake Park
4515 - Bodie Town	6660 - Legionnaire Park
5110 - Dillon Woods	6970 - Turnbull Canyon
5115 - Boydon's Cave	7100 - Fossil Beds
5120 - Hume Lake Area	7105 - Deer Farm Park (Arrowhead)

7130 - Crystal Cave

7235 - Oak Glenn Divide

7515 - Buckman Springs

7520 - Carrisso Gorge

7523 - Cave Cout's Ranch

7545 - Mission Gorge

7550 - Mallet Island

7630 - Petrified Forest - Imperial County.



5

III, 16 Projects <sup>eliminated</sup> for reasons closely analagous to those of Class I and II but not falling precisely under the wording there used.

(a) Projects which, while not lying within the boundaries of incorporated municipalities are surrounded by or closely adjacent to such municipalities and are well within the limits of the metropolitan agglomerations of San Francisco or Los Angeles, occupying land of high urban values and so situated as to be serviceable mainly for local daily use by those metropolitan populations thus falling into a class metropolitan urban parks logically indistinguishable from the typical case of parks within municipal boundaries excluded by law from the State Park System.

6640 - Malibu (Rindge) Ranch

6805 - Los Angeles County Beach Park.

6900 - Playa Del Rey Marshes

6980 - Pacific Gun Club Beach

3580 - Contra Costa Hills Park.

<sup>eliminated</sup>  
Projects <sup>for</sup> reasons closely analagous to those of Class I and II but not falling precisely under the working there used

III (Cont)

(b) 11 projects which if situated in some other part of the state would have considerable distinction but which do not stand out sufficiently from their local surroundings in view of their probable cost, or which embody features more or less satisfactory<sup>ly</sup> represented in other projects that are more advantageous, or which can clearly be deferred for some years without much danger of loss:

- 2176 - Hemlock Park se

*Defer* 2153 - Centerville Beach dd

*Defer* 2189 - Mendocino Pine Barrens dd

*Defer* 2186 - Klamath River dd

- 2152 - Cowell Memorial (What is status) se

- 2183 - Lake Leonard se

- 2312 - Tanberk Grove se

*Defer* 2880 - Madelaine Plains - See also Fish & Game. dd

- 5560 - Cypress Point se

- 6310 - San Marcos Ranch se

*Defer* 7524 - Chocolate Range dd

IV. 51 projects primarily because (1) now part of a National Park, adequately protected and open to public enjoyment, or (2) included within the boundaries of a National Park and legitimately the duty of the National Government to acquire and administer as part of the park, or (3) part of a National Forest wholly free from included private holdings and reasonably protected as to scenic and recreational values, or (4) within a National Forest and presenting no condition, either as to included private holdings or otherwise, that would seemat present to offer any justification for creating a State Park within the Forest, or (5) now held and protected by some other public or quasi-public agency and clearly not in urgent need of action by the State.

In addition I would withdraw from immediate consideration:

County

3810- McArthur Redwoods

5350- Redwood Mountain, Redwood Canyon

State

2175- Golden Oak Park

Alumni

3450- Standford's Home ( Historical)

Church

5520- Carmel Mission

National Forest

2600 - Mt. Shasta Park

2675 - Trinity Alps

2681 - Marble Mountain

2683 - Medicine Lake

2685 - Modoc Lava Beds (N. Monument)

3205 - Forest Hill

National Forest

3225- Georgetown Divide

3154- Colusa County Park

3275- Greek Store Park

4115- Big Meadows

4315- Tragedy Springs Monument  
(Historical.)

4625- Mammoth Lake Park

4755- Rock Creek Lakes

4760- South & North Lake Park

4875- Virginia Lakes

4900- Walker River Park

4535- Mono Hot Springs

4975- White Mountains Sheep Park

5107- Blainey Meadows

5108- Cascade Valley

5116- Fresno Grove

N. Forests

5121- Mono Creek  
5122- McKinley Grove  
5127- Iron Mountain  
5130- Crown Valley Park  
5255- Mineral King Park  
5257- Mt. Whitney  
5265- Mt. <sup>Plumas</sup> Whitney  
5290- Redwood Mountains  
5305- Simpson Meadows  
5315- South Fork Park  
5685- Monterey Co. Beach Park(Pfeiffer Pt.)  
5730- Bristlecone Fir  
6112- Frazier Mt. Bear Park(Game)  
6300- Squaw Flat  
6810- Mt. Gleason  
6825- Mt. Wilson  
6835- Mount San Antonio (Mt. Sheep)  
6975- Santiago Peak  
7120- Bear Lake  
7400- San Geronimo and San Bernardino Mts.  
7625- Palomar Mountain

National Parks

2625- Drakesbad Park  
3773- Muir Woods (N. Monument)  
4225- Lake Eleanor  
4325- Yosemite National Park

9

V. 73 Projects for the fencing in and preservations of certsin  
species of animals, which projects should be referred to the Fish and  
Game Commission before passing on them.

2310 - Roosevelt Elk.

~~2575 --- Klamath Lake~~

(Madeline Plains - 2680)

2688 - Modoc Antelope Park.

2990 - Yolo Bolly Bear Park.

3405 - Marshland Park

4310 - Snelling Beaver Park.

5106 - Buena Vista Elk Refuge

7990 - Yuma Beaver Park.

VI. 14 Projects and groups of projects closely associated with State Highway rights of way and 4 projects which would be submerged or affected by the construction of the Kennett Reservoir, all of which should be referred to the Department of Public Works before passing on them.

2195 - Navarre Redwood Park.

2567 - Castle Craggs Highway Park.

2575 - Klamath River Camp Ground

3120 - Cliff & River Park

3203 - Fair Oaks Bridge Park

3207 - Folsom Bridge Park

3280 - Highway Parks.

4215 - Highway Division Parks.

5325 - Valley Oak Park

5825 - Skyline Parks.

5555 - Mt. Charlie Big Tree

5515 - Black Mountain Park.

5610 - Bodfish Canyon - (Extension to Skyline)

5635 - Highway Division Parks.

6117 - Highway Division Parks.

4513 - Aspen Park (?)

6640 - Malibu (Rindge) Ranch.  
(See III (a))

Kennett Reservoir.

2565 - McCloud River

2570 - Cinnebar Springs.

2515 - Baird Caves

2550 - Big Springs

SECRETARY OF STATE, DEBRA BOWEN  
The Original of This Document is in  
CALIFORNIA STATE ARCHIVES  
1020 "O" STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

R191.003, box 4, folder 1